



# Reconstruction of Andhra Chronology

By GIRINDRASHEKHAR BOSE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Numbers refer to paragraphs and not to pages]

	Para No
1 PRESENT POSITION OF ANDHRA CHRONOLOGY	1
Andhra Chronology requires Revision	1
I SUMMARY OF ANDHRA CHRONOLOGY AS ACCEPTED	
AT PRESENT	2
Khāravela and Śātakarni 168 B C	2
Simuka the first Andhra King 230 B C	3
Gautamiputra and Pulumāvi 106 A.D -150 A.D	4
The end of the Andhras 225 A.D	5
Reference	6
II THE ANDHRAS IN ANCIENT LITERATURE	7
The Andhra People and the Andhra Country	7
Bali and the Andhra Deśa	8
Ancient Andhra Kingdom	9
Kālidāsa does not mention the Andhras	10
Omission of the name Andhra in Ancient Reference	11
III. PURANIC ACCOUNT OF THE ANDHRAS	12
Puranic Account of the Mauryas and the Sungas	12
Kanvas and Andhras	13
Modern Version of Andhra History	14
IV REASONS FOR ACCEPTANCE OF PORTIONS ONLY OF THE PURANIC ACCOUNT	15
Puranic Account and Inscriptions	15
Purānas partly accepted	16
V LIMITATIONS OF INSCRIPTIONAL AND NUMISMATIC DATA	17
Inscriptional Evidence is really an Interpretation	17
Relevant Inscriptional and Numismatic Records	18
VI MODERN SCHOLARS AND ANDHRA CHRONOLOGY	19
Literary Evidence	19 (1)
Hātigumpha Inscription	19 (2)
The Andhras and the Kalingas	19 (3)
Śātakarni and Simuka	19 (4)
Nanaghat Inscriptions	19 (5)
Gautamiputra and Uṣabhadāta	19 (6)
Gautamiputra's Date	19 (6a)
Rudradāman and Pulumāvi	19 (6b)
Pulumāvi the Son of Gautamiputra	19 (6c)
Kings No 23 and No 24	19 (6d)
Ptolemy and the Andhras	19 (7)
The Traikūṭaka Dynasty	19 (8)
Andhra Reign. 230 B C -225 A.D	20
Two Pillars of Andhra Chronology	21
2 PROVINCIAL RULERS ..	22
VII KṢĀTRĀPAS AND MAHĀKṢĀTRĀPAS	22
Kṣātrāpas and the Paramount Power ..	22
Kṣātrāpas of Indian Descent ..	23

	Para No
OF PROVINCIAL GOVERNORS	24
Issues of Provincial Rulers	24
Provincial Rulers	25
OF COINS	26
Minted only by Provincial Rulers	26
ING OF COINS	27
ing of Coins is not necessarily a Proof of	
ry	27
struck Coins	28
e Trove Act in Ancient India	29
INGS	30
XI CLAN NAME OF THE ANDHRA KINGS	30
Śātakarni a Clan Name	30
Origin of the name Śātakarni	31
XII GOTRA NAMES OF THE ANDHRA KINGS	32
Gotra Names and Matriarchy	32
Gotra Names and Patriarchy	33
XIII MULTIPLE NAMES DIFFICULTIES OF IDENTIFICATION	34
Uncertainty regarding Names	34
Same Name for different Kings	35
XIV NICKNAMES OF THE ANDHRA KINGS	36
Nicknames indicating Bodily Peculiarities	36
Artistic Nicknames	37
False Identifications	38
Defects in Puranic Time Records	39
4. ANDHRA TIME RECORDS	40
XV ANDHRA TIME RECORDS	40
Inscriptional and Puranic Regnal Years	40
Regnal Years and Provincial Governorship	41
XVI WESTERN SATRAPS THE ŚAKA ERA	42
The Use of the Śaka Era by Satraps	42
Royal Princes who did not succeed to the	
Throne	43
Minting of Coins by small Independent States	44
XVII THE THEORY OF KUṢĀNA ORIGIN OF THE ŚAKA ERA	45
Western Satraps were Feudatories of the	
Kuṣānas	45
No Positive Proof of Kuṣāna Origin of Śaka Era	46
Kadphuses as Founder of the Śaka Era	47
Probable Andhra Origin of the Śaka Era	48
Difficulties in accepting the Theory of Kuṣāna	
Origin of the Śaka Era	49
XVIII RUDRADĀMAN AND PUṢUMĀVI	50
The Significance of Defeat of Puṣumāvi by	
Rudradāman	50
5. EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE	51
XIX UNRELIABILITY OF EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE	51
Caution in admitting Epigraphic Evidence	51
Changes in the Brāhmī Script No Established	
Law of Change	52
The Margin of Error Vagueness in Indication	53
Difference of Opinion	54
Jayaswal	54 (1)
Chanda	54 (2)
Bhagvanlal Indraji	55
Rapson	56
Rapson on Epigraphy as applied to Coins	57
Different Headings	58

	Para	No
XX FALLACIES IN EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE	59	
Persistence of Old Forms of Writing	59	
Futility of Epigraphic Evidence	60	
Risks of relying on Epigraphic Evidence	61	
6 TWO GROUPS OF DATA	62	
XXI TWO GROUPS OF ANDHRA DATA	62	
Correlation of Puranic and Inscriptional Data	62	
XXII CANONS FOR ESTABLISHING IDENTITY	63	
The Fourfold Basis of Identity	63	Identity of
Names	63	
Identity of Incidents	64	
Identity of Dates and of Places	65	
XXIII AMENDING PURANIC ACCOUNTS	66	
Disagreement between Puranic and Inscriptional Records	66	
Puranic Statements should not be amended	67	
XXIV PITFALLS IN IDENTIFICATION		HYPOTHETICAL
ILLUSTRATION FROM ENGLISH HISTORY	68	
Hypothetical English Purāna	68	
A Hypothetical Account	69	
A Hypothetical Inscription	70	
Tabulation of the Hypothetical Data	71	
Conclusions from the Hypothetical Data	72	
The Emergence of an Artificial Dark Period in History	73	
Results of Faulty Correlation of Data	74	
Mere Identity of Names is often a False Guide	75	
Identity of Incidents is not a Safe Guide	76	
Identity of Uncorrected Dates is a Safe Guide	77	
XXV A COMPARISON WITH ANDHRA CHRONOLOGY	78	
Possibility of getting Dates from the Purānas	78	
The Kings whose Dates are available	79	

	Para No
Mūgadhas, Sūtas and Purāṇakāras	97
The Sound Resemblance of different Readings	98
<b>7 PURANIC CHRONOLOGY</b>	99
XXVIII PURANIC CHRONOLOGY	99
Viṣṇu, Vāyu and Matsya suffice in drawing up connected Chronology	99
Andhra Chronology as a Part of a Bigger Scheme	100
XXIX NANDA AS REGENT OF MAHĀNANDI	101
Twofold Check for Regnal Periods	101
Nanda as Regent	102
XXX THE SAPTARṢI CENTURY	103
The Cycle of 2,700 Years	103
The End of the Saptarṣi Cycle during the Andhra Period	104
The Kali Yuga	105
The Maghā Century and the Kali	106
The Parikṣit Andhra Interval of 1,893 Years	107
The Concord of four different Counts in Puranic Chronology	108
XXXI REGNAL PERIODS AND THE GENERATION INTERVAL	109
The Generation Interval	109
'Average Regnal Period' is a False Guide	110
Determination of Generation Interval	111
The Generation Interval in the Purāṇas	112
British Figures	113
The Average Generation Interval is $28 \pm 6$ Years	114
Variation of Generation Interval	115
Averages of Reigning Periods for the Puranic Dynasties	116
Vincent Smith's Doubts are untenable	117
XXXII PRESERVATION OF THE PURĀṆAS	118
Discrepancies	118
Successive Redactors of the Purāṇas	119
<b>8 THE PURANIC ERA</b>	120
XXXIII THE ERA USED IN THE PURĀṆAS	120
Nanda's Coronation Date as Point of Reference	120
The Nanda Era	121
The Fate of the Nanda Era	122
XXXIV TRANSFORMATION OF THE NANDA ERA	123
Social Order in the Kali Yuga	123
Kalki and the New Kṛta Age	124
Contemporaries of Kalki	125
The Extension of the Old Kali Yuga	126
Divya Years and the Kali Yuga	126 (1)
Transition Periods	127
XXXV NANDA'S CORONATION AND THE KALI ERA	128
The Old Kali and the 28th Pitṛ Yuga	128
Falsification of Puranic Conception in Nanda's Times	129
Nanda is described as an Incarnation of Kali	130
Fixing Nanda's Coronation at 401 b C	131
<b>9 CORRELATION OF DATA</b>	132
XXXVI CORRELATION OF DATA. GAUTAMĪPUTRA AND PUṢUMĀVI	132
Inscriptional Dates for Gautamīputra and Puṣumāvi	132
106 A D -150 A D	132

	Para No
Puranic Dates for the 6th and the 7th Kings 74 a C-148 a C	133
Identities of Śrī Śātakarni with Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni and of Lambodar with Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi	133 (1) 134
XXXVII YAJÑAŚRĪ The Date of Yajñaśrī from Chinese Records 408 A D	134 135
XXXVIII CANDRAŚRĪ Yue gnaī and Yajñaśrī	136 136
XXXIX ŚĪSUKA AND VIKRAMĀDITYA The Story of Vikramāditya Vikramāditya's Death at the Hand of Śālvāhana	137 137 138
Vikramāditya's Defeat at the Hand of Śālvāhana	139
Śīsuka the Conqueror of Vikramāditya	140
Contemporaneity of the first Andhra King and Vikramāditya	141
The Vikram Samvat 57 B C	142
The Andhras and the Nāgas	143
Śīsuka's Accession in 21 b C	144
XL THE FOUR POINT CONTACT External Support for the Puranic Dates of the Andhras	145 145
XLI DURATION OF THE ANDHRA REIGN The Andhra Empire lasted from 21 b C to 435 a C	146 146
Rapson's Argument is not tenable	147
The Traikūṭaka Date supports Puranic Account	148
There is no Dark Period following the Andhras	149
XLII THE BALAŚRĪ INSCRIPTION An important Document	150 150
Gautamīputra Śātakarni as Overlord and Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi as Provincial Governor	151 152
Gautamīputra's Territory	153
Puranic Tradition in Gautamīputra's Times	154
Gautamīputra and his conquered Enemies	155
Gautamīputra's Ancestors	155
10 THE ORIGIN OF THE ŚAKA ERA	156
XLIII THE ŚAKAS IN ANCIENT INDIA The Śakas were no New comers	156 156
King Sagara and the Śakas	157
Indianization of Foreigners	158
Indian Names and Racial Traits of the Śakas	159
XLIV THE ORIGIN OF THE ŚAKA ERA Śakāditya and Vikramāditya	160 160
The Śaka Era	161
Khakharāta and Śakarāṭ	162
The Prestige of the Andhra Dynasty was re established by Gautamīputra	163 164
Gautamīputra's Efforts at Popularity	165
The Conciliatory Policy of Gautamīputra	166
The Starting of the Śaka Era	166
The Western Satraps were Tributaries to the Andhras	167

		Para No
XLV	GAUTAMĪPUTRA AND THE WESTERN SATRAIS	168
	The Appointments of Bhūmaka, Caṣṭana and Puḷumāvi as Provincial Governors	168
11	QUEEN BALAŚRĪ, QUEEN JĪVASŪTĀ AND GAUTAMĪPUTRA SRI ŚĀTAKARNĪ	169
XLVI	GAUTAMĪPUTRA AND UṢABHADĀTA JĪVASŪTĀ	169
	INSCRIPTION	169
	Gautamīputra's Inscription	169
	Jīvasūtā's Inscription	170
	Jīvasūtā the Name of Gautamīputra's Queen	171
	Gautamīputra did not act as a Provincial Governor	172
	Camp of Victory	173
	Significance of the Gift of Uṣabhadāta's Lands made by Gautamīputra	174
	Renewal of Privileges was not necessary	175
	Uṣabhadāta's Overlord	176
XLVII	GAUTAMĪPUTRA PUḶUMĀVI AND BALAŚRĪ	177
	Puḷumāvi's Regnal Years The Date of Balaśrī's Death	177
XLVIII	CHRONOLOGY OF GAUTAMĪPUTRA'S TIMES	178
	78 A D as Key Date of Gautamīputra's Times	178
12	QUEEN NĀYANIKĀ AND GAUTAMĪPUTRA YAJÑAŚRĪ ŚĀTAKARNĪ	179
XLIX	THE NANAGHAT INSCRIPTIONS QUEEN NĀYANIKĀ	179
	The Nanaghat Inscriptions and Epigraphic Evidence	179
	The Images and Names	180
	The Date of Nanaghat Inscriptions	181
	7 Andhrabhṛtyas and 23 Andhras	182
L	THE ANDHRA SUB CLANS	183
	The Andhra Sub Clans and the Meaning of the Word Viḷivāyakura	183
	The last 4 Śātavāhanas	184
LI	VEDISIRI AND HAKUSIRI	185
	Hindu Religious Revival	185
	Meaning of the Name Hakusiri	186
	Vedaśrī, Vadaśrī and Cadasāti	187
	Vāsiṣṭhīputra Vedaśrī	188
LII	SIMUKA AND ŚĪSUKA	189
	Śīsuka is probably the correct name of the first Andhra King	189
	The Nanaghat Inscriptions were very likely executed by the Queen of Yajñāśrī	190
LIII	YAJÑAŚRĪ AND RESTRUCK COINS OF NAHAPĀNA	191
	Peculiarities of the Joghalmembhī Hoard	191
	Coins bearing the Legend 'Gautamīputra Śātakarnī'	192
13	SOME TENTATIVE IDENTIFICATIONS	193
LIV	KRṢṆA AND VĀSIṢṬHĪPUTRA ŚĪVA ŚRĪ PUḶUMĀVI	193
	Difficulties in identifying the 'Pulumāvi' of the Coins	193
LV	SOME TENTATIVE IDENTIFICATIONS	194
	Filling up the Gaps	194

	Para No
14 RECONSTRUCTED ANDHRA CHRONOLOGY	195
LVI RECONSTRUCTED ANDHRA CHRONOLOGY	195
Chronological History	195
Reconstructed Andhra History	196
The Bid for Sovereignty	197
The Great Gautamīputra	198
Provincial Governors under Gautamīputra	199
The Andhras and the Kusānas	200
The End of the Andhra Empire	201
The Andhras as Patrons of Learning	202

### ABBREVIATIONS

- Names and references mentioned only once are given in full in the body of the text and are not included here
- Authors' Names* are indicated by three capital letters each
  - BLI Bhagvanlal Indraji
  - DRB D R Bhandarkar
  - EJR E J Rapson
  - MMW Monier Monier Williams
  - RDB Rakhal Das Banerji
  - VAS V A Smith
- Books* are indicated by a capital letter followed by two small letters
  - Bgp Bhāgavat Purāna
  - Cea Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, the Western Ksatrapas, the Traikūṭaka Dynasty E J Rapson. Published by the Trustees of the British Museum, London, 1908
  - Dtp Dvātrimsat Puttalikā, complete works of Kālidāsa  
Published by S C Chakravarti, Calcutta
  - Ehi The Early History of India V A Smith. Revised by S M Edwards Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1924, 4th Edition
  - Klp Kalki Purāna
  - Mbh Mahābhārata
  - Mtp Matsya Purāna
  - Ppv Purānapravēśa Bongali Girindrashekhar Bose Published by M C Sarkar & Sons, Ltd, 15, College Square, Calcutta, 1934
  - Rgm Raghuvamsam Kālidāsa
  - Sed A Sanskrit English Dictionary Monier Monier-Williams  
Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1899
  - Skp Skanda Purāna
  - Vap Vāyu Purāna
  - Vip Viṣṇu Purāna
- Journals* have been indicated by groups of appropriate small letters each preceded by a j
  - jasb Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
  - jbbas Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society



jhrs Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society  
 ja Indian Antiquary  
 jras Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

- 5 *Reports, Proceedings, Lists, etc* are indicated by at least two small letters each

ap Appendix to Reconstruction of Andhra Chronology  
 asw Report of the Archaeological Survey of Western India  
 bg Bombay Gazetteer  
 ei Epigraphia Indica  
 ls Lüders list of Brahmi Inscriptions Appendix to Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archaeological Survey of India, Vol X

- 6 *Publishers, Editors, Translators etc* are indicated by a single small letter preceded by a hyphen

-a Ānandāśram publications  
 -b Bāṅgavāsī publications  
 -w Translated or quoted by H Wilson and edited by T Hall

- 7 *Editions* are indicated by Arabic numerals, e g , Second edition 2nd

- 8 *Volumes, Books, Chapters and Sections* when requiring a special mention are indicated by Roman numerals, e g , Fourth volume IV Third Book III Purāṇa adhyāyas are indicated by numbers, e g , Viṣṇupurāṇa, Bāṅgavāsī publication, Fourth Book, Twenty fourth adhyāya, śloka 32 Vip b IV 24 32

- 9 *Pages, Lines, Ślokas, Foot notes* are indicated by numbers after suitable small letter or letters, e g , Third page p 3 Pages 210 and following pp 210 Lines 4 to 6 ll 4-6 Foot note No 3 n 3 Ślokas 240 and following 240

- 10 *Paragraphs* of Reconstruction of Andhra Chronology are indicated by numbers within brackets, e g , 23rd Para (23)

- 11 *Dates* Years elapsed after Christ a C Years elapsed before Christ b C Actual dates in Christian era A D or B C

- 12 *Sequence of Mention* The single small letter symbols for publishers, editors, etc which follow the symbols for the names of the books are separated from the latter by a hyphen All other individual symbols are separated from one another by full stops  
 Author Book-Publisher, Editor or Translator Year of Publication Edition Book, Chapter or Section Page Line Foot note

One or more of the above items may be omitted Instead of page numbers chapter and verse numbers may be introduced, e g , Viṣṇupurāṇa, Bāṅgavāsī publication, fourth book, twenty fourth chapter, verses 34 to 42 Vip b IV 24 34-42

## 1 PRESENT POSITION OF ANDHRA CHRONOLOGY

1 *Andhra Chronology requires Revision* The chronology of the Andhra kings of ancient India as accepted at present requires a drastic revision

2 *Khāravela and Śātakarni 168 B C* According to the account of the modern historical scholars Asoka's great empire began to show signs of disintegration towards the latter part of his reign. The Kalingas and the Andhras under Kṣemarāja and Simuka respectively broke away from the Maurya yoke about 240 to 230 B C

I Summary of Andhra Chronology as accepted at present

Kṣemarāja's name is to be found in the Hatigumpha inscription in which his grandson Khāravela's military conquests and other activities are recorded. The inscription is dated in the 13th year of Khāravela's reign and in the year 165 of Rāja Muriya, i.e., of Candragupta. Assuming Candragupta's date of accession to be 322 B C, Khāravela's accession would be placed in (322—165+13 =) 170 B C. In the second year of his reign, i.e., in 168 B C, Khāravela defied Śātakarni 'the protector of the West'. Śātakarni's name is to be found in another inscription at Nanaghat in which his father's name Simuka is also mentioned.

3 *Simuka the first Andhra King 230 B C* The purāṇas give a dynastic list of the Andhra kings together with the regnal period of each. Although the puranic account of the Andhras cannot be admitted in its entirety the portions that do not come into conflict with epigraphic evidence may be accepted. In the puranic Andhra dynastic list we find the names of the first three kings as Śīsuka or Śipraka, Kṛṣṇa and Śātakarni in order of their succession. Śīsuka is the corrupt form of Simuka of the inscription. The name of the second king Kṛṣṇa also is to be found in another inscription. The purāṇas state that Kṛṣṇa was the brother of Simuka and that Śātakarni was the son of Simuka. This latter statement is supported by inscriptional evidence. Epigraphic considerations show that all the inscriptions bearing the names of Simuka, Śātakarni and Kṛṣṇa belong to the second century before Christ. The beginning of Andhra reign is thus to be fixed at about 230 B C which would be the time of Simuka. The Andhras therefore were contemporaries of the later Mauryas, of the Sungas who came after them and of the Kanvas who followed the Sungas. According to the purāṇas the total period of reign of the Andhra dynasty is about 450 years and the number of kings 30. These figures can be accepted. The purāṇas are however obviously wrong in stating that the first Andhra king Śīsuka murdered the last Kanva king who reigned till about 28 B C, and usurped the

throne, and that the Andhra dynasty succeeded the Kanvas. Some later Andhra king might have killed the last Kanvas.

4 *Gautamīputra and Pulamāvi 106 A D - 150 A D* The next Andhra kings of any importance whose names appear in inscriptions are Gautamīputra Śātakarni and his son Vāsisthīputra Pulamāvi who are to be identified with kings Nos. 23 and 24 of the purāṇas. Inscriptions at Nasik and Karle show that these kings were contemporaries of certain satrap kings named Nahapāna, Castana and Rudradāman who ruled over western India at the time. The dates of these western satraps have been preserved in inscriptions and coins. This evidence proves that Gautamīputra Śātakarni and Vāsisthīputra Pulamāvi must have reigned during the period 106 A D to 150 A D. Ptolemy, who flourished about 120 A D to 160 A D, mentions Pulamāvi as if he were his contemporary. A Nasik inscription records that Gautamīputra Śātakarni was a great conqueror 'who destroyed the Sakas, Yavanas and Palhavas' who rooted out the Khakharāta family, who restored the glory of the Śātavāhana race'. The Andhra kings belong to the clan known variously as Śātikarni, Śātakarni, Śāhvāhana or Śātavāhana. Nahapāna the western satrap belonged to the Khakharāta or Kshaharata family. Thus it seems it was Nahapāna that was uprooted by Gautamīputra Śātakarni, an evidence of this fact is to be found in the discovery of a large number of coins of Nahapāna struck over with the legend of Gautamīputra Śātakarni as a sign of his conquest. The twenty-seventh king in the puranic list is Yaśjñāśrī. Numerous coins and inscriptions mentioning the name of this king have been discovered. He seems to have been also a very powerful monarch ruling over extensive territories.

5 *End of the Andhras 225 A D* Various inscriptions and coins containing the names of other Andhra kings such as those of Cutakadānanda, Mudānanda, Gautamīputra Viśvāyānaka, Vāsisthīputra Viśvāyānaka, Mātharīputra Śivalakura, Śivaśrī Śātakarni, Śrī Candra Śati, Catarpana, Śrī Rudra Śātakarni, Śrī Kṛṣṇa Śātakarni, Śrī Candra, Śivaśkaṇḍa Varman and a few others have been found. Some of these kings have been identified according to the puranic list while the positions of others remain uncertain. The Andhra kingdom came to a close about 225 A D. This was followed by a dark period in Indian history. Vincent Smith writes, 'But the third century after Christ is one of the dark spaces in the spectrum of Indian history, and almost every event of that time is concealed from view by an impenetrable veil of oblivion' (Ehli p. 226).

6 *Reference* This short account of the Andhras has been culled from Rapson's 'Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra

Dynasty' and Vincent Smith's 'The Early History of India' It will refresh the memory of the reader and will serve as an introduction to the discussion that follows

7 *Andhra People and Andhra Country* Mention of the Andhras is to be found in ancient Sanskrit literature in many places, the oldest being the well-known passage in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*. The Andhra people have been mentioned also in the *Mahābhārata* (*Mbh-b* Sabha 31 71 and *Bhishma* 9 49). The purāṇas however form the main depository of our information regarding the ancient Andhras. The ancient Andhras, as their present-day descendants do, lived in the deltas of the Godavari and the Krishna rivers on the eastern sea coast of India. The Andhra country, i.e., the part of India where these people lived, has been called the Andhra Deśa. The Andhras have often been in later times grouped together with the Kalingas who were their neighbours and who occupied the territory to the north of the Andhra Deśa.

8 *Bali and Andhra Deśa* The purāṇas mention a king of the Anu dynasty named Bali who was a contemporary of the Ikṣvāku king Māndhātṛ. Bali's kingdom lay to the south of the Vindhya Ranges. Bali had five sons begotten by the sage Dīrghatamas through his queen Sudesna. These sons were named Anga, Banga, Kalinga, Suhma and Pundra. Each of them became the ruler of the province named after him. Apparently these provinces had formed part of Bali's empire. The Bhāgavat purāṇa mentions a sixth son who has been called Oudra in some manuscripts and Andhra in others. (*Bgp-b* 9 23 5, 6). The purāṇas specifically mention the fact that Bali's 'sons' were Kṣatriyas. (*Vis-b* IV 18 1 *Vap-a* 99 28). If we reject the doubtful Bhāgavat tradition and accept the other account we may say that the earliest Andhra kingdom must have been formed long after the establishment of the kingdom of Anga, Banga, Kalinga, Suhma and Paundra. In early times, previous to its consolidation as a separate kingdom, Andhra Deśa formed part of the Anu empire under Titiṣu who has been described in the purāṇas as a renowned king ruling in the east (*Mtp-a* 48 22). Bali was Titiṣu's great-great-grandson. After Bali the Anu empire was divided among his sons as mentioned and Andhra Deśa seems to have been included in the kingdom of Kalinga.

9 *Ancient Andhra Kingdom* Andhra people and Andhra kingdom are not identical entities and the further distinction between an Andhra king (i.e., a king belonging to the Andhra race) and a king of the Andhras (who may not necessarily be an Andhra himself) should be kept in mind. The *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* speaks of the Andhra people as base descendants of Vasiṣṭha. They have been classed with the uncivilized Pulindas. (*Āitareya Brāh* vii 18). On the other hand the early kings who ruled

over the Andhras belonged to the Anu family and were Kṣatriyas. No reference to any name of any Andhra king is to be found in Sanskrit literature, as far as I know, down to the time of the Kanvas. There seems to be no doubt, however, that a separate Andhra kingdom was an established fact before the Mahabharatan war and rulers of the Andhra people existed either as independent kings or as feudatories to some sovereign power. Reference to such rulers is to be found in the Mahābhārata in the passages previously cited.

10 *Kālidāsa does not mention the Andhras.* Curiously enough in describing Rāghu's military conquests of different people Kālidāsa does not mention the Andhras in his Rāghuvamśa. Rāghu's victorious army penetrated into the eastern kingdoms bordering on the sea, conquered Suhina, Banga, Kalinga and Pāṇḍya (Rgm 4 32-49). The Pāṇḍya territory formed the extreme south of India. The Pāṇḍyas are to be distinguished from the Pāṇḍras. Kālidāsa's omission of the mention of the Andhras is remarkable. If Kālidāsa were a contemporary of the Guptas he must have been familiar with the great Andhra tradition.

11 *Omission of the name Andhra in Ancient Reference.* One also misses the name of Andhra in many passages in the purāṇas and the Mahābhārata where one would expect it to be present. It is possible that although the Andhras had existed as a people for a very long time past no separate Andhra kingdom was formed till about the time of the Mahabharatan war. This may be the reason why the name Andhra is not found associated with Kalinga in literary references to early period. In references to later periods these names often occur together. The first literary mention of an Andhra king as distinguished from a king of the Andhras is to be found in the purāṇas in connection with the description of the Andhra dynasty.

12 *Puranic Account of Mauryas and Sungas.* The purāṇas are unanimous in asserting that one Sindhuka or Śipraka or Śikuka, who belonged to the Andhra race and who was a servant (apparently a provincial governor) of the last Kāṇva king, overthrew his master and occupied the throne. It should be remembered that according to the purāṇas the empire ruled by the Mauryas passed on to the Sungas. The first Sunga king Pusyamitra was a provincial governor or a general under the last Maurya king Bhadratha. Pusyamitra killed Bhadratha and exalted his own son Agnimitra to the throne and governed the empire in the name of the latter. Pusyamitra has been described by Kālidāsa in his Mālavikāgnimitra as 'senāpati' or commander-in-chief of his son Agnimitra. Matsya in referring to Pusyamitra (Mtp a 272-27) says 'kārayisyati bai rājyam', which means 'caused the empire to be governed by another'. The dethroning of Maurya Bhadratha by his 'servant' Pusya-

III Puranic  
Account of the  
Andhras

mitra had many precedents Candragupta who was apparently a governor of the Nandas had usurped the empire of his master, so also had Pradyota's father Mūka overthrown his master Ripuñjaya and installed his own minor son in his place. It seems that in deference to public opinion neither Mūka nor his later prototype Puṣyamitra ventured to occupy the throne themselves. Both of them made their sons emperors.

13 *Kanvas and Andhras* History repeated itself again when Vāsudeva the first Kanva, who was a servant of the last Sunga king, murdered his master and occupied the throne. The last Kanva king Suśarman in his turn was killed by his 'servant' Sīpraka or Simuka the Andhra who stepped into the throne and became the founder of the Andhra dynasty. The purāṇas are unanimous in asserting that Sindhuka or Sīpraka belonged to the Andhra race (Vap-a 99 348, Mtp-a 273 2, Vip-w IV p 194) and that it was he that had usurped the throne by killing the last Kanva king. The purāṇas do not state that the Maurya empire broke up after the death of Aśoka as has been supposed by modern scholars. The puranic description implies that the empire in a more or less complete form passed from the hands of the Mauryas to those of the Sungas and from the Sungas to the Kanvas and from the Kanvas to the Andhras.

14 *Modern Version of Andhra History* Modern scholars are of opinion that the Andhras did not come after the Kanvas and that the puranic version is wrong in asserting that it was the first Andhra king who had killed Suśarman the last Kanva. Vincent Smith writes 'The Purāṇas treat the whole Āndhra dynasty as following the Kānva, and consequently identify the slayer of the last Kānva prince with Simuka or Sīpraka, the first of the Āndhra line. But, as a matter of fact, the independent Āndhra dynasty must have begun about 240 or 230 B C, long before the suppression of the Kānvas about 28 B C and the Āndhra king who slew Suśarman cannot possibly have been Simuka. It is impossible to affirm with certainty who he was, because the dates of accession of the several Andhra princes are not known with accuracy. All that can be affirmed at present is that the slayer of Suśarman, the last Kānva, apparently must have been one or other of three Āndhra kings, namely Nos 11, 12 or 13. The year 28 B C may be accepted as the approximately true date of the extinction of the Kānva dynasty, because it depends, not on the duration assigned to each several Āndhra reign, but on the periods of 112 and 45 years respectively allotted to the Sunga and Kānva dynasties, which seem worthy of credence, and this date, 28 B C apparently must fall within the limits of one or other of the three Āndhra reigns named above. Foot-note close of Maurya dynasty, c 185 B C from which deduct  $112+45 = 157$ , leaving 28' (EhI pp 216, 217)

15 *Puranic Account and Inscriptions* The reasons that have led modern scholars to reject portions of the puranic account are, as already stated, mainly based on inscriptions and numismatic evidence. The puranic version of Andhra history has been corroborated in certain

IV Reasons for Acceptance of Portions only of Puranic Account particulars by the discovery of Andhra coins and inscriptions. No modern scholar is therefore disposed to reject the puranic story wholesale. If we neglect the purāṇas altogether there will not be much to write about the Andhras or, in fact, about any ancient Indian royal dynasty that would be considered history. All workers on Andhra history have thus made efforts to correlate their numismatic and other findings with the puranic account. They have rejected those portions of the purāṇa story only that come into conflict with their own conclusions. There is nothing in the purāṇas about the Andhras that is inherently impossible. No Andhra king has been endowed with any fabulous longevity nor has any been made the hero of an impossible feat.

16 *Purāṇas partly accepted* It will be noticed that scholars like Vincent Smith, although they reject the puranic order of dynastic succession, have accepted the statement of the purāṇas that Śiśuka or Simuka was the founder of the Andhra dynasty. That Simuka killed Suśarman is not believed, but the statement that Suśarman was killed by an Andhra king has been accepted and the slayer has been sought to be identified with the Andhra king No 11, 12 or 13. So also the total period of Andhra reign, as mentioned in the purāṇas, has been held to be true but not the reigning periods for the individual kings. Rapson writes 'The latest inscriptional date for the reign of Gautami-putra is the year  $24 = A D 130 + x$  in a postscript to the Nasik edict above referred to. This date is interesting, as it affords a means by which the evidence of the Purāṇas can be tested and is found wanting, for with great unanimity they seem to agree in assigning a reign of 21 years only to this king' (Cca p xxx). It seems that modern scholars have accepted, rejected, amended and modified puranic data as they suited their own conclusions. All this may appear to be making wild work of the purāṇas but if we remember the generally unrecognized dependence of modern scholars on puranic materials for their historical account of ancient India and their eagerness to correlate puranic data with their own we can very well understand their ways of handling the purāṇas and their express attitude towards them (85, 86, 87).

17 *Inscriptional Evidence is really an Interpretation*

V Limitations of Inscriptional and Numismatic Data

Inscriptional and numismatic data by themselves can at most give us a mere skeleton or more correctly a part of a skeleton of history in the majority of cases. It is their interpretation that lends to them their first flesh covering. This

*interpretation* is known to the historian as inscriptional or numismatic *evidence*. Although the inscriptional datum itself can seldom be challenged a good deal of uncertainty creeps into its interpretation at times. This is the reason why different scholars have come to different conclusions starting from the same numismatic or inscriptional data. This fact is very often forgotten and an undue reliance is placed on so-called inscriptional *evidence* which is really an interpretation. It is necessary to reiterate this as, although scholars are alive to this possibility of error, a warning is necessary because, when it comes to the practical application of this principle, mistakes are frequently made and a mere probability is often posited as a certainty. I shall have occasion to cite illustrations later on.

18 *Relevant Inscriptional and Numismatic Records*. Quite a fair amount of material in the shape of inscriptions and coins is now available for the elucidation of the history of the Andhras. Instead of going through the list of all the inscriptional and numismatic data, it will be profitable for the present to examine only those that have a bearing on Andhra *chronology*, so that we may test the reliability of the conclusions of modern scholars with respect to cases in which they have differed from the purāṇas. Inscriptional and numismatic details that are not essential to the purpose of this discussion have been left out here, but it should be noted that no serious student can afford to disregard any such detail or material, however insignificant it might appear to be at first sight. I should therefore urge my readers to turn to the full original sources before coming to a decision regarding any disputed point raised in this article.

19 The main arguments of modern scholars in fixing Andhra chronology may be summarized as follows —



Khāravela's inscription shows that he was the third king of the Cheta or Chaita dynasty of Kalinga. So his grandfather must have been the person who broke free from Maurya overlordship, his period would approximately be c. 232 B.C. (Cea p. xvi), and this would coincide with the period of Aśoka's death immediately after which disintegration of the Maurya empire was likely to have set in.

19 (3) *Andhras and Kalingas* It is likely that the Andhras, like their neighbours the Kalingas, declared independence about the same time so that the first Andhra king, called Śiśuka or Śipraka by the purāṇas, and who may be assumed to have been the same person as Simuka of the Nanaghat inscription, may be supposed to have been a contemporary of Khāravela's grandfather, the first Cheta king of the Kalingas. Vincent Smith says 'the independent Andhra dynasty must have begun about 240 or 230 B.C.' (Eli pp. 216, 217).

19 (4) *Śātākarni and Simuka* The purāṇas say that the first Andhra king was Śiśuka, the second his brother Kṛṣṇa and the third Śiśuka's son Śātākarni. Since this Śātākarni is the third in succession from Śiśuka, the contemporary of the first Chaita king, he must be the Śātākarni of the Khāravela inscription, Khāravela being also the third king counting from the same point of time. It is therefore clear that the Śātākarni of the Khāravela inscription is the third Andhra king of the purāṇas, and his date is 168 B.C. as already stated.

19 (5) *Nanaghat Inscriptions* The Nanaghat inscription that indicates that Śātākarni was the son of Simuka, the founder of the Andhra dynasty, is written in a script which is similar to the Aśokan script. There is another inscription at Nanaghat which bears the name of king 'Kanha (Kṛṣṇa) of the Śātavāhana race'. This Kanha is the second Andhra king Kṛṣṇa of the purāṇas. Rapson quotes Bühler as follows 'According to the epigraphical evidence, these documents may be placed a little but not much later than Aśoka's and Daśaratha's edicts. But what, in my opinion, most clearly proves that they belong to one of the first Andhras is that their graphic peculiarities fully agree with those of the Nasik inscription (No. 1) of Kanha or Kṛṣṇa's reign'. Rapson continues 'The Nasik inscription referred to bears the name of "King Kanha (Kṛṣṇa) of the Śātavāhana race," and it was assigned by Bühler, on epigraphical grounds, to "the times of the last Mauryas or the earliest Sungas, in the beginning of the second century B.C."' (Cea p. xix).

19 (6) *Gautamīputra and Uṣabhadāta* At Nasik an inscription has been discovered which is dated in the year 18 of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātākarni (Is 1125). Another inscription has been found at Karle which is also very likely dated in the year 18 of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātākarni (Is 1105). Both these inscriptions record the gift made by Gautamīputra of lands which had just previously belonged to Uṣabhadatta (Uṣabhadāta).

The first inscription specifically mentions the name of Rsabhadatta. We can get Rsabhadatta's date from other inscriptions. At Nasik an inscription has been found in which is recorded the construction of a cave by Rsabhadatta, son-in-law of Nahapāna (Is 1131). Other inscriptions of Rsabhadatta have been found bearing the dates 41, 42 and 45 (Is 1133). An inscription at Junnar has been discovered executed by Ayama, minister of Nahapāna, dated year 46 (Is 1174). These dates are very likely in Śaka era and therefore 41 to 46 would correspond to 119 to 124 A D. We learn from another inscription that Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni extirpated the Khakharāta family to which Nahapāna belonged. Nahapāna's coins are found struck by Gautamīputra.

19 (6a) *Gautamīputra's Date* Rapson writes 'Gautamīputra's conquest of Nahapāna seems undoubtedly to have taken place in the 18th year of his reign. We therefore have the equation — Gautamīputra's year 18 = 124 A D + x. On this synchronism, on the recorded regnal dates in the inscriptions of other Andhra sovereigns, and on the known date 72 = 150 A D of Rudradāman as Mahāksatrapa, rests at present the whole foundation of the later Andhra chronology' (Cca p xxvii). Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni's date of accession would thus be 106 A D + x (Cca p xxx). Gautamīputra figures as the 23rd king in the puranic list.

19 (6b) *Rudradāman and Pulumāvi* There is an inscription in the Girnar mountain executed by Rudradāman and dated in the year 72 = 150 A D in which is recorded that he twice defeated Śātakarni the lord of Dakṣiṇāpatha (Is 965). Rudradāman was the grandson of Castana and the father-in-law of Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi (the son of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni) whom he defeated.

19 (6c) *Pulumāvi the son of Gautamīputra* A Nasik inscription dated in the year 19 of Vāsisthīputra Śrī Pulumāvi executed by his grandmother Queen Gautamī Balaśrī enables us to make out that Vāsisthīputra Śrī Pulumāvi was the son of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni (Is 1123).

19 (6d) *Kings No 23 and No 24* Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni and Vāsisthīputra Śrī Pulumāvi have been identified with kings No 23 and No 24 of the purāṇas. They have been called respectively Gautamīputra and Pulumā in the purāṇas. Their dates would thus lie between 106 A D and 150 A D.

19 (7) *Ptolemy and the Andhras* The Greek geographer Ptolemy, who died after 161 A D and who lived at Alexandria for forty years, writes about Pulumāvi and Castana in a way that seems to indicate they were contemporaries with him (Ehli p 232, Cca p xxxix).

19 (8) *Triakūṭaka dynasty* In Mahārāstra the Andhras were succeeded by a dynasty of Ābhīras who very likely belonged

to the Traikūṭaka dynasty. Inscriptions and coins show that the date of the beginning of the Traikūṭakas is 294 A D (Cca p xlv)

20 *Andhra Reign 230 B C to 225 A D* Vincent Smith writes 'the long series of Āndhra kings came to end about A D 225. The testimony of the Purāṇas that the dynasty endured for either 456 or 460 years, or, in round numbers, four centuries and a half, appears to be substantially accurate. The number of the kings also appears to be correctly stated as having been thirty' (Ehi p 224)

The Andhra dynasty is thus supposed to have reigned from 230 B C to 225 A D, i e., for about 455 years

21 *Two Pillars of Andhra Chronology* Briefly stated the whole structure of Andhra chronology as built by modern scholars rests mainly on two pillars, viz., the identification of Śātakarni of the Khāravela inscription with the third Andhra king in the puranic list on the one side and the identifications of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni and Vāsisthīputra Śrī Śātakarni, also called Vāsisthīputra Śrī Pulumāvi, with Gautamīputra and Pulomā kings Nos 23 and 24 respectively of the purāṇas on the other side. Before I proceed to test the validity of these three identifications it will be profitable to discuss certain general questions pertinent to the problem

## 2 PROVINCIAL RULERS

22 *Kṣatrapas and the Paramount Power* It should be remembered that the purāṇas mention genealogies only of sovereign powers and not of any satrap or provincial governor, however powerful he might have been. In this connection the distinction between what we call a 'King' in English and a 'Raja' or a 'Narapati' or a 'Rāstrapati' (e g., Dakṣināpathapati) or a 'Kṣatrapa' or a 'Mahākṣatrapa' should be borne in mind. It seems that during the Andhra period the titles ksatrapa and mahākṣatrapa were originally used by provincial rulers of Parthian or Scythian descent acknowledging suzerainty of some paramount power. Very likely their relations with the paramount power consisted merely in the payment of tribute of some sort. They were free to mint their own coins, wage war against neighbouring provinces and act in any other way they liked. It is probable that a ksatrapa was often subordinate to a mahākṣatrapa who was the direct tributary of the paramount power. A mahākṣatrapa might have several kṣatrapas under him. Sometimes a ksatrapa would wage war on other kṣatrapas and usurp their dominions and, perhaps by paying a higher tribute to the paramount power, would be recognized as a mahākṣatrapa. Mahākṣatrapas and kṣatrapas often ruled contemporaneously (Cca p xxvii n). It appears also that the paramount power

did not bother itself as to who became the *ksatrapa* or *mahāksatrapa* of a particular province so long as it received the stipulated tribute

23 *Ksatrapas of Indian Descent* In later periods rulers of Indian descent also sometimes styled themselves *ksatrapas* or *mahāksatrapas* after having ousted rulers of Scythian descent from their possessions. Perhaps the association of these titles with a particular province was so firm owing to long continued rule by foreigners to whom the epithets properly belonged that when an Indian stepped into their place he found it more convenient to use the same designations in State matters as those of his predecessors. The facts collected about the western satraps of the Andhra period by Rapson (Cca e, ci) would serve to support the validity of the above assumptions

24 *Four Classes of Provincial Rulers* Rulers of different provinces under a paramount power in ancient India can be placed under different classes. In the first place, we might have kings who had lost their original independence as a result of aggrandizement of the paramount power and had become tributary to it. In describing Raghu's conquests Kālidāsa compares such defeated kings with the paddy plant which yields grain when uprooted and planted again. The conqueror who after defeating an independent king reinstated him as tributary has been called '*dharma-vijayi*' or the righteous conqueror (Rgm 4 37-43). In the second place, provincial rulers of one paramount power might transfer their allegiance to another as a result of military conquest by the latter. Greek satrapies under Seleukus were transferred to Candragupta after the defeat of the former. In the third place, special officials might be appointed by the paramount power to rule over certain provinces, e.g., a military commander might be appointed as a governor in a province liable to invasions by other powers (Kaṁṣka's governors). Fourthly, princes of the royal blood and relations of the royal family might be appointed, irrespective of their merits, in certain provinces. Sometimes minor princes occupied the position of provincial rulers under the protection of some elderly person of the royal blood. Khāravela inscription records that he was a Yuvarāj at sixteen.

25 *Royal Provincial Rulers* It is conceivable that a prince of the royal line in his capacity as a provincial ruler might come into conflict with a neighbouring governor under the same paramount power just as different *ksatrapas* might fight among themselves and it is further conceivable that the paramount power would remain neutral in such fights so long as it received its revenues from one party or another. In the course of this article I shall have occasion to show that in all probabilities such a contingency did arise at least twice during the Andhra reign (50). The posts of provincial governors, except

in the cases of the princes of the royal blood who would succeed to the throne of the paramount ruler, were generally hereditary. An examination of the coin legends and inscriptions of the Andhra period shows that the prefix 'śrī' was used only by persons of the royal family. The satraps, although they called themselves 'rajas', did not put the honorific 'śrī' before their names, on the other hand we find legends of royal personages in which only 'śrī' occurs and no 'rājā'. I shall presently cite reasons for believing that the title 'rājā' without the 'śrī' was very likely confined to provincial rulers only and when it is found associated with a 'śrī' it is even then no bar to the supposition that the person of the royal blood might have been a provincial governor at the time the coin, bearing the legend, was struck or the inscription carved.

26 *Coins minted only by Provincial Rulers* The provincial rulers during the Andhra period issued coins and it is quite likely that a prince of the royal blood also issued coins in his own name during the period of his provincial governorship. Rapson writes 'Indian coin types are essentially local in character. At no period with which we are acquainted, whether in the history of Ancient or of Mediæval India, has the same kind of coinage been current throughout any of the great empires. Each province of such an empire has, as a rule, retained its own peculiar coinage, and this with so much conservatism in regard to the types and the fabric of the coins, that the main characteristics of these have often remained unchanged, not only by changes of dynasty, but even by the transference of power from one race to another' (Cca pp xi, xii). The obvious conclusion that can be drawn from the facts noted by Rapson is that the paramount power never troubled itself with the issue of coins—a function which was left to the discretion of the provincial rulers. The central government, it seems before the Guptas at any rate, did not attach much importance to the minting of coins and in the case of big empires it is doubtful whether any special central imperial coin was ever issued. This would explain the absence of any coin bearing the name of emperors such as Aśoka on the one hand and the great preponderance of coins belonging to the satraps on the other. The conservatism in coin types that Rapson has noticed would make any guess regarding the age of a particular type of script on any coin in the absence of dates a hazardous game. I shall have occasion to refer to this problem again.

27 *Restriking of Coins is not necessarily a Proof of Victory*  
 X Restriking of Coins In view of the indifference of the central government to provincial coins it is extremely unlikely that the imperial power would think of restriking any coin to commemorate any victory as has been supposed in the case of the restruck coins of Nahapāna. It is

practically impossible for any imperial power to call back all coins of a particular type in circulation merely for the purpose of restriking them. This method of commemorating a victory, to say the least, can only attain partial success. Then again in considering the problem of the restriking of coins one has to remember that of three Andhra rulers Vāsisthīputra Vīlvāyakura, Mātharīputra Śivalakura and Gautamīputra Vīlvāyakura, all apparently belonging to the same family, each of the last two restruck coins of his predecessor or predecessors. There is no evidence to show that this was done to commemorate any victory of one over the other or others. (191, 192)

28 *Double-struck Coins* Double-struck coins belong to the same category as restruck coins. Such coins of Gautamīputra Vīlvāyakura and of Gautamīputra Śrī Yajña Śātakarni have been found. Restruck punch-marked coins have also been found suggesting the possibility that the restriking was done when the original markings got effaced by usage (Walsh *Punch-marked Silver Coins*. Their standard of weight, age and mint, *jas* 1937 Apr.) In view of these considerations the argument that restriking of a coin by another king is a proof of military victory on his part loses much of its force. It is difficult to say in the absence of any definite information what might have led to the restriking of particular coins. The hypothesis of military victory is only one possibility among many, and this hypothesis fails altogether when applied to double-struck coins and to restriking by successive rulers belonging to the same family. It is probable that just as we have special coronation medals struck at the time of accession of kings at the present time, coins were similarly restruck in ancient times on special occasions for distribution as alms, etc. This would explain the presence of coins that have been restruck by a ruler of the same family as the one issuing the original coin and also of double-struck coins bearing the same legend of the same ruler twice. This explanation will be especially applicable to those cases in which there is no sign of any effacement of the original stamping due to usage. Effacement of the original markings, whether as a result of usage or of any other factor, will very likely account for restriking in a certain percentage of cases as has already been stated.

29 *Treasure Thore Act in Ancient India* The denominational values of ancient coins were very likely in the majority of cases greater than their intrinsic values. If anybody was fortunate enough in discovering a hoard of coins belonging to a former reign in those days the only way to utilize the coins profitably would be to get them restamped with the current legend by the State mint and release them for circulation. Melting the coins would not be a business proposal. It is mentioned in *Manu-samhita* and *Mitākṣarā* that if any person, other than a learned brahmin, discovers a hidden treasure, the king shall

appropriate one-sixth or one-twelfth of the amount. A learned brahmin discoverer of a hoard may keep the whole of it for himself. If anybody fails to intimate the discovery of a treasure hoard to the State, he shall forfeit the whole of it, and the king shall punish the discoverer suitably (Manu 8 35 39, Mitākṣarā-Vyavaharādhaya 34, 35). It is therefore quite likely that in the event of a discovery of a hoard of coins, not current at the time, the government would restamp the coins, take a part of the same for its own coffers and give the rest to the discoverer.

### 3 THE ANDHRA KINGS

30 *Śātakarṇi a Clan Name* The names of the Andhra kings, as recorded in the purāṇas and in inscriptions and coins, are worthy of careful consideration. It is very difficult to get at the personal names of these kings. We have to take into account their clan name. The clan name itself shows great variation in different records. In the purāṇas, for instance, we have Śātikarna, Svātikarna, Śātikarni, Śāntikarna, Śāntakarni and Svāti, apparently all variations of the same name. In traditions we come across the names Śatavāhana, Śātavāhana, Śāta-vāhana and Śālivāhana. In coins and inscriptions we have Śāta, Śātavāhana, Śātakarni, and Svāti. The origin of the clan name Śātakarni, which seems to be the proper designation, cannot be definitely traced. The literal meaning of the word is 'one who has handsome ears'. Both Śātakarni and Śatakarni are correct forms according to this derivation.

31 *Origin of the name Śātakarni* It seems that besides the Andhra kings there were others who bore the personal name Śātakarni. There is an author of this name who wrote a treatise on alankāra (Śātakarni on Alankāra quoted by Śaṅkara. Ox. 135a. Catalogus Codicum Sanscriticorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae by Aufrecht). Kūḥdāsa records the tradition of a ṛṣi of the name of Śātakarni, living somewhere on the banks of the Godavari before the time of Rāma. This sage was a very renowned person because of his austerities (Rgm 13 38-40). It is just possible that the Andhra kings claimed their descent from this famous holy man. Another tradition traces the name to one Śāta or Śāla who was a Yākṣa and who became a lion later on. This Yākṣa was the first Andhra king's *vāhana*, i.e., he used to carry the king about. Two other clan or sub-clan names occur in inscriptions and coins associated with the Andhras, namely, Viḥvāyākura and Śivalakura. Whether these two clans or sub-clans are identical with the Śātakarni clan or whether they are different cannot be definitely stated. (183)

32 *Gotra Names and Matriarchy* Besides the clan name some of the Andhra kings also bear *gotra* names. It appears from their gotra designations that they came from matriarchal families. Vatsyāyana in his Kīmasūtra records that in Dikṣmāpātha matriarchy was the social order 'Mātulakulānnivartī dukṣmīpāthe' (Kāvyasamprayukta 3 1) Even at the present day we find matriarchy prevalent in southern India. The gotra names are all derived from the names of ancient rṣis and are used even now both by brāhmanas and by non-brāhmanas. In patriarchal families the gotra name takes the male form in male descendants, e.g., Gautama Buddha, but in matriarchal societies since the gotra name comes through the mother it takes a female inflection and then the word 'putra' has to be added to it to make it an appropriate designation for a male member, e.g., Gautamīputra Śātākarni, which means that Śātākarni is the son of a woman who belongs to the Gautama gotra. In the case of females it is impossible to determine from the gotra name alone to which type of family she belongs, e.g., Gautamī Balaśrī may be the member of either a matriarchal or a patriarchal family.

33 *Gotra Names and Patriarchy* In patriarchal families the same gotra name is transmitted through successive male issues and is a common epithet for all members of the same dynasty whereas in matriarchal societies it changes from father to son. The father and the son thus always belong to different gotras as marriage within the same gotra is not allowed by Hindu custom. Thus in a matriarchal family, like that of the Andhras, Gautamīputra Śātākarni's son can never be a Gautamīputra but can be a Vāsisthīputra, or Mātharīputra or Hārītiputra. The importance of the woman is far greater in a matriarchal society than in a patriarchal one, and in royal families of the former type it is not at all uncommon to find women associated with State affairs. Sometimes the sister's son gets preference over the son in succession to properties in matriarchal societies.

34 *Uncertainty regarding Names* It was customary in ancient days to address a person by his gotra name instead of by his personal name, particularly when special honour was intended to be shown by the addressor. The use of personal names was thus limited to intimate circles of relations and friends in the case of kings. This is perhaps the reason why so much uncertainty exists regarding the correct names of ancient rulers. In the different purāṇas, for instance, the same king has been called under such different names as Adhīśāmakṛṣṇa, Adhīśāmakṛṣṇa, Adhīśomakṛṣṇa and Aśīmakṛṣṇa. Among the Andhra kings the names that seem to be personal are (1) Śīpraka, Śīmuka or Śīsuka, (2) Kṛṣṇa, (3) Pulomā, Pulumāvi,

XIII Multiple  
Names Difficulties  
of Identification



Pulumāyi, Palumān or Pulomāchi, (4) Aristakarmā, Nemikrsna, Riktavarṇa or Goraksakrsna, (5) Pattalaka or Mandulaka, (6) Pravillasena, Putrikasena or Purindrasena, (7) Śivaśrī, (8) Yajñaśrī, (9) Vijaya, and (10) Candraśrī, Dandaśrī, Cadaśrī or Vadaśrī. The gotra names found are Gautamīputra, Vāsisthīputra, Mātharī or Mādharīputra and Hāntīputra. In some families it was the custom to designate the son according to the mother's personal name, e.g., Gaurika which means 'son of Gauri', Yasomatika meaning 'the son of Yasomatī', etc.

35 *Same Name for different Kings* The clan and gotra names combined were often considered enough to designate any particular king. Sometimes only the clan name or the gotra name has been mentioned so that an identification becomes still more problematic. Almost all the Andhra kings could be designated as Śātakarni and certainly more than one could call himself Gautamīputra Śātakarni. To add to the confusion several kings with identical personal names are to be found in the Andhra dynasty. There are at least three Pulumāvis or Pulomās among Andhra kings. Thus there may be more than one Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi. Then again it was common in ancient India in royal families for the same series of names to be repeated for the father and the sons at intervals of several generations. According to the Viṣṇupurāṇa Parikṣit I and Parikṣit II had sons with identical names, viz., Janamejaya, Srutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena. We have the same state of affairs in England also. There are four Williams, six Georges, eight Edwards and eight Henries among forty English kings. Supposing that definitely dated records were absent it would be a problem for the historian of the future to determine who was who from names only (71, 72, 76). We are experiencing the same difficulty with reference to the past Andhra dynasty.

36 *Nicknames indicating Bodily Peculiarities* Identification has been rendered still more difficult by the presence of more than one name for one king and of nicknames of royal personages. Some Andhra kings are known only by their nicknames. The third puranic Andhra king has the name Śrī Mallakarni according to the Matsyapurāṇa. This appears to be a nickname and it means 'the royal one with the (twisted) ears of an athlete'. The fourth king has the name Purnotsanga meaning 'the one with a full haunch'. The fifth king, according to the Hall manuscript, has the name Skandhastambhi meaning 'the stiff shouldered'. The seventh king has the name Lambodar meaning 'the long bellied'. The eighth king, it appears, bore two nicknames, viz., Dwibīlaka and Apitaka. The first means 'one with two (prominent nasal) holes' and the second 'the fat one'. All these names refer to some bodily peculiarities of the kings. If we are to credit the nicknames with any significance we may infer that the Andhra stock was well-built and had big mascula-

#### XIV Nicknames of Andhra Kings

ture and that the kings were devoted to wrestling and athletic exercises. Some colour is lent to this supposition by the description of personal features of King Gautamīputra to be found in the Nasik inscription of his mother (Is 1123) (Transcript in bg Vol XVI, p 550) The relevant lines are as follows 'Patipuna eadī madala sasirika pīvadasanasa varavārana vikamācūvikumasa bhujagapātī bhoga pīnabata bipula dīgha sūda [ra] bhujasa. This means 'whose appearance has the grace of full lunar circle, whose gait is as pleasing as that of the noblest elephant, whose arms are as muscular, rounded, massive, long and beautiful as the body of the king of serpents'

37 *Artistic Nicknames* The jest of irreverential nicknames seems to have pursued the first eight kings after which the names become more respectable and even artistic. Among the later kings we have such names as Kuntala meaning 'lock of hair', Sundara 'the fair one', Cakora or 'Greek partridge', Yajñaśrī or 'the sacrificial grace' and Candrasrī or 'the beauty of the moon'. Candrasrī has also been called Vadasrī or 'the grace of discourse'. The names Saktīśrī and Vedasī have been found in an inscription; they mean 'the grace or beauty of strength' and 'the grace of the Veda' respectively.

38 *False Identifications* In view of the welter of clan, gotra and nicknames and paucity of personal names of Andhra kings and in view of the fact that different kings sometimes bore the same name and the same king many different names, it is extremely hazardous to effect a concordance between the two series of data as found in the purāṇas on the one hand and in inscriptions and coins on the other. As I have already pointed out, it is very difficult and often impossible to say who is who in the absence of dates on the two sides and the chances of mistaken identity are very great. I shall point out presently that such false identifications have actually been made in the working out of Andhra history by modern scholars.

39 *Defects in Puranic Time Records* It is generally believed that the purāṇas, although they, like a modern historical work, mention regnal years of kings and the total periods of reign of the different dynasties and the order of their succession, are not entirely trustworthy, then again the purāṇas do not record any specific date in terms of any era. There can therefore be no absolute point of reference-time on the puranic side. The inscriptions enable us to fix the time of three of the Andhra kings at least, viz., Śātakarṇi, Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi and Viśiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi. Thus there exists a sort of absolute time scale on the inscriptional side but none on the puranic side. This state of affairs naturally makes it difficult for us to correlate the two series of data and chances of mistaken identity cannot be eliminated.

## 4 ANDHRA TIME RECORDS

40 *Inscriptional and Puranic Regnal Years* I shall consider some of the peculiarities of the inscriptional Andhra time records before I take up the problem of puranic time reference with regard to the same dynasty. None of the inscriptional records of Andhra sovereigns bear any time reference in terms of any era. They mention only the regnal years of individual kings. There is a discrepancy between puranic and inscriptional accounts of regnal periods in the case of some of the kings and on the strength of this the puranic account has been declared untrustworthy (Cca p xxx). I should like to point out certain fallacies in this connection. First, the identification may have been wrong, secondly, we should always keep in mind the probability of some of the Andhra kings' acting as provincial governors before they came to occupy the imperial throne. In such an eventuality the period of governorship and the period of overlordship being continuous would be taken together and the regnal years mentioned in inscriptions would have to be counted from the time of the beginning of provincial governorship. There is evidence to show that Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi reigned in the capacity of a provincial governor simultaneously with his father Gautamīputra Śātakarni (DRB Dekkan of the Śātavāhana Period ja June 1918 p 152 See also 151). While inscriptions are likely to record the conjoint regnal period of Pulumāvi the purāṇas mention only the duration of his subsequent overlordship or actual reign as emperor as they are mainly concerned in recording the turn of events from the imperial standpoint.

41 *Regnal Years and Provincial Governorship* Since the title 'rājā' was very likely associated with provincial governorship any inscription or coin legend bearing that title conjointly with the royal prefix 'śrī' would indicate that it was executed during the period of provincial reign of the prince. In the case of Yajñaśrī of the purāṇas, about whose identification with Gautamīputra Svāmī Śrī Yajña Śātakarni of the inscriptions not much doubt exists, the purāṇas record a regnal period of nine years only, while we find from inscriptions that he reigned for at least twenty-seven years. A long period of provincial rule was not likely to be followed by another long period of imperial reign except in the case of a prince who happened to have ruled as a minor under the guardianship of somebody else during his governorship. If we assume that Yajñaśrī had been a provincial ruler before he became a king and that the inscription mentioning the 27th year of his reign (Cca p li) was incised during this period we can get the total period of Yajñaśrī's reign by adding the minimum of 27 years as governor to 9 years as an imperial ruler as mentioned in the purāṇas. There is the other possibility

that the inscription was carved while Yajñaśrī was an imperial ruler, this would give a minimum of 18 years as the period of his provincial reign. The large variety of the coins that Yajñaśrī struck is, from this standpoint, to be considered as a corroborative evidence of his long period of provincial governorship at different places. As mentioned before, no coin of Yajñaśrī is to be expected for the period of his reign as the paramount lord. I have not mentioned the case of other kings as I shall show that considerable uncertainty exists regarding their identity. In view of the possibilities mentioned here it will not be justifiable to discredit the puranic account of regnal period of any king solely on the ground of its discrepancy with the inscriptional data.

42 *Use of the Śaka Era by Satraps* Although princes of the royal blood of the Andhra dynasty do not mention any era in inscriptions the western satraps mostly record time in terms of the Śaka year which begins in 78 A.D. In fact it is their use of this known era and the contemporaneity of some of them with certain Andhra kings as found in inscriptions that have enabled the modern scholar to determine the dates that form 'the whole foundation of the later Andhra chronology'. None of the great imperial rulers of old seem to have used any era that might have been current in their times. Each one of them dated his records in terms of his own regnal years. It was only the satraps or the provincial governors outside the royal family who used a common era. Whenever we come across any time record in terms of regnal years of any person the presumption would be that he was an independent ruler or a prince of the royal blood who aspired to be an independent king some day. The use of a common era like the Śaka era, particularly in the absence of any reckoning of regnal period, by any person would be, on the contrary, a presumptive evidence in favour of his subordinate position. The western satraps of the Andhra period who used the Śaka era in their records never called themselves 'mahārājās' nor did they use the honorific 'śrī' in connection with their names. The only exception seems to be Svāmi-Simhasena whose coin legend reads 'Mahārāja-Ksatrapa-Svāmi-Simhasenasva' (Cca p 190). The 'mahārāja' seems to have been a title of courtesy here conferred by the paramount power. The association of the epithet 'ksatrapa' with 'mahārāja' proves that his was a subordinate position. No independent ruler would delight in using an epithet like 'ksatrapa' which implies dependence. Simhasena was not in the direct line of Rudradāman II the latter being his maternal grandfather. It is likely that Simhasena's father was an Andhra prince. This supposition explains the use of the title of mahārāja by him. He was ousted from the throne by Isvarasena and became a mahāksatrapa.

regnal years in his coins (Cea p 124) Perhaps he had an ambition to rule as an independent sovereign or, as is more likely, he belonged to an Andhra royal sub-clan (183)

43 *Royal Princes who did not succeed to the Throne* It is highly improbable that all princes of the royal blood who had served their provincial governorship would be fortunate enough to ascend the imperial throne. Death, disease, intrigue and more powerful rivals might conceivably interrupt a career. Under these circumstances one would expect to find inscriptions with legends showing the epithets 'rājā' and 'śrī' and time records in regnal years without being able to assign the person concerned a place in the list of imperial rulers. Such a case appears to have been that of Catarapana. The inscription mentioning his name at Nanaghat shows the legend 'Rano Vāsisthputra Catarapana-Śātakanisa' dated in the year 13 (Is 1120, Cea pp xli, li) There is no doubt that he belonged to the royal Śātakarni clan and ruled over some territory, yet he cannot be given a place with any degree of certainty in the list of Andhra kings. Very likely the same fate as that of Catarapana overtook Mahāhakuśrī of the Nasik inscriptions (Is 1117, 1141, Cea pp xx, xlii)

44 *Minting of Coins by small Independent States* Only in the case of big empires with a well-organized system of provincial governors would one expect the absence of imperial coins minted by the central government. Where the independent ruler controlled a comparatively small territory he would naturally strike coins in his own name, mention his own regnal periods and would perhaps use an era started by himself or by one of his illustrious ancestors. In an inscription by Dahrasena, son of Indradatta, we find mention of an era (Traikūṭaka) and the legend 'Mahārājendradattaputra Parama-Vaiṣṇava Śrī-Mahārāja Dahrasena' (Cea p 198) Here we find the association of 'śrī' with 'mahārāja', there is no mention of his being a ksātropa or a provincial ruler under a paramount power. He used an era perhaps started by some of his ancestors as it mentions the year 207. The obvious conclusion is that Dahrasena must have been an independent king directly ruling over a territory without the help of provincial governors and issuing coins in his own name and recording time in terms of a family era and regnal periods.

45 *Western Satraps were Feudatories of the Kusānas* The western satraps who belonged to the family of Castana used the Śaka era. Very likely the Ksaharātas belonging to the family of Nahapāna also did the same, there is however some doubt on this point (RDB jras 1917) Rapson writes 'that the dates of the western ksātrapas are actually recorded in years of the Śaka era, beginning in 78 A D, there can be no

XVII Theory of Kuṣāna Origin of Śaka Era

possible doubt. The question of the origin of this era has, therefore, an important bearing on the history of this dynasty. The titles "ksatriapī" and "mahāksatriapī" certainly show that the western ksatriapas were originally feudatories, and the era used by them is presumably, as is regularly the case in similar instances, the era of the dynasty to which they paid allegiance. Until recent years Fergusson's theory that the Saka era was founded by Kamska was more generally accepted than any other, but a host of rival theories have since been proposed, and it cannot be said that at the present time there is any general consensus on this subject among scholars. One of the main objections brought against Fergusson's theory was that Kamska was not a Saka but a Kusāna, but this objection is not insuperable if the suggestion just made may be entertained, *viz.*, that the *name* of the era which is not found in inscriptions, until after the power of the western ksatriapas had been well established, may have been derived from the kings who used it rather than from the king

some Kuṣāna king rests only on the fact that there existed a powerful Kuṣāna empire at the time of the epoch of the era. There is no independent evidence to show that either Kadphises II or Kanīška ascended the throne exactly in 78 A D or that there was some special Kuṣāna event that might account for the foundation of the era. On the other hand if we consider (i) the close affinity of the Andhra coins with those of the western satraps—an affinity that made Rapson consider the two series of coins together in his book, and (ii) the significance of the name Śālivāhana which is inseparably associated with the Śaka era in Indian tradition, we are led to the admission that in all probability the era was started by an Andhra or a Śālivāhana king. I shall point out other arguments in support of this view later on (161, 166, 167)

49 *Difficulties in accepting Theory of Kuṣāna Origin of Śaka Era* On the supposition that Kadphises II founded the Śaka era it is difficult to understand why Kanīška, his immediate successor to the throne, and belonging to the same family, should have thought of starting another era of his own. Admitting that Kanīška did start an era, it will be difficult to explain the continued use of the Śaka era even during Kanīška's time by the western satraps who are supposed to have been under him. Therefore probably either Kanīška did not start an era or the western satraps were not under him. It may be that both the above propositions, viz., that (i) neither Kanīška founded an era, (ii) nor the western satraps were under him, are true. If it can be proved that the Andhras started the Śaka era and that the Kuṣānas dated their records in terms of it, it will have to be admitted that the latter were in all probability subordinates to the former. Both the western satraps and the Kuṣānas would then have to be considered feudatories to the same sovereign power, namely, the Andhras. The purāṇas do not mention the Kuṣānas which they presumably would have done had the Kuṣāna power been a paramount one for any length of time. The Andhras are the only paramount rulers of this period according to the purāṇas.

#### 50 *Significance of Defeat of Pulumāvi by Rudradāman*

XVIII Rudra-  
dāman and Pulu-  
māvi There is a fact in this connection that is very significant as throwing some light on the position of the western satraps during the Andhra period. Rudradāman I boasts in an inscription (Is 965) of having defeated the lord of Dakṣiṇāpatha twice in fair fight. The defeated ruler was very likely Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi. Rudradāman spared his life because he was a near relation (son-in-law). What seems very peculiar is that Rudradāman did not seize any of these two opportunities to dispossess his son-in-law and to usurp the Andhra emperor's crown. He could have easily made his son-in-law a feudatory under him and with the enhanced resources at his command

could have defied the paramount power to whom he was a satrap at the time. The fact that he did nothing of the sort but meekly continued in the position of a glorified servant, *viz*, that of a mahāksatrapa and even boasted about it is to be best explained on the supposition that both he and his son-in-law were tributaries to the same sovereign power, *viz*, Gautamīputra. Gautamīputra lived till 130 A D (Table IV), the fight took place before this date. For reasons which I have already discussed before, it can be assumed that the paramount power would not interfere in a struggle between two of its provincial rulers. Although Rudradāman was victorious over his son-in-law who was presumably a provincial ruler at the time of the fight, he dared not defy the imperial power. He did not usurp the throne of the Andhras because the paramount Andhra power remained unconquered, it also remained indifferent, presumably it continued to receive its dues from mahāksatrapa Rudradāman. Had Rudradāman been a Kusāna satrap, his new acquisitions of victory would have meant a loss of revenue to the paramount Andhra power whose representative was the defeated son-in-law of Rudradāman. The paramount power would certainly have interfered in such a contingency. It was not overthrown, nor did it fight Rudradāman. The frequent shuffling of territories from the Sātakarnis to the western satraps and *vice versa* (Cca pp cxx, cxxi), that forms an interesting problem of Andhra history, is satisfactorily explained on the supposition that in most cases it was a change in provincial governorship only and did not affect the central power in any way.

## 5 EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

51 *Caution in admitting Epigraphic Evidence* In fixing the time of the inscriptions referring to the Andhra kings epigraphic evidence has been requisitioned to a very great extent. It is well known that the form and other characteristics of the alphabet change in the course of time and epigraphists have sought to determine the rate of these changes and thus to fix the time of an undated inscription starting from the form of letters of a known date. The reliability of any epigraphic evidence should be very carefully considered before it is taken as final. Unfortunately historical scholars have not always been very critical about their judgment of epigraphic finding and they have often placed an undue amount of reliance on it as I shall presently show.

52 *Changes in the Brāhmī Script* No Established Law of Change In cases of the dated coins of western satraps the changes through which the forms of the Brāhmī alphabet passed during the Andhra period 'may often be traced with great chronological accuracy' (Cca p xii) so that it is possible for epigraphists to



say that so much change has occurred in so many years. There is nothing to say against such assertions, they are mere statements of facts. When, however, it comes to a consideration of the problem from the opposite angle, i.e., when one has to fix the date of an inscription from the nature of the deviations that have occurred from a known standard of a known period, the matter becomes quite different. There are so many factors that go to determine the type of the alphabet or writing in an inscription that any definite statement becomes an impossibility. One must have established laws of change supported by proper evidence before one can hazard an opinion. For example, it is one thing to say that a particular train has taken so much time to cover so much distance and quite another to say on the basis of the above fact that since so much distance has been covered by another train it must have taken so much time, there are unknown periods of stoppage and other disturbing factors on the way in the absence of knowledge of which no prediction can be considered reliable. The margin of error may be so great as to render all conclusions valueless.

53 *Margin of Error Vagueness in Indication* Statisticians always consider the questions of probable error and standard deviation before they put their reliance on any figure arrived at by such methods as described above. It is true that epigraphists often qualify their estimates by saying that such and such a date is correct 'within a margin of not more than a hundred years' but when it comes to a practical application the 'margin' is very often forgotten and statements and conclusions assume a definite character for which there is no warrant. Then again there is no objective scientific standard for determining the 'margin'. Every individual worker makes his own guess and the different guesses vary widely from one another. The vagueness that characterizes the assertions of historians in this matter is to be seen further in their way of statement of the 'margin' of error. They do not usually indicate the direction of error so that it is difficult to understand what is actually meant by such expressions as 'margin of error of a hundred years'. Does it mean that the date might be wide of the mark in each direction by a hundred years so that an inscription for which an epigraphic estimate fixes the time at, say, 150 A D might have been actually executed at any time between 50 A D and 250 A D or does it mean that the actual date would be somewhere between 100 A D and 200 A D? All confusion might be avoided if the amount of possible error and deviation is stated as a plus-minus quantity so that 150 A D  $\pm$  100 years would mean that the date may vary within the limits 50 A D and 250 A D.

54 *Difference of Opinion* The following quotations from the writings of recognized historical authorities will serve to illustrate the wide difference of opinion that exists among scholars in regard to epigraphic evidence. Referring to the Hatigumpha

inscription, the date of which is the keystone of modern Andhra chronology,

54 (1) *Jayaswal* Jayaswal says 'The characters which are Northern Brāhmī have been already discussed by Bühler. It is sufficient to say that they are regarded by him to belong to about 160 B C. The history of development of the Brāhmī letters from the third century B C. to the first century A C. is so well known to the Indian epigraphist that the age of an inscription falling in that period could be definitely fixed within an ambit of 30 years or so' (Jhors III Hathigumpha Inscription of the Emperor Khāravela p. 428)

54 (2) *Chanda* Speaking of the same inscription Ramaprasad Chanda writes 'But the wide difference in form between the alphabet of the edicts of Asoka on the one hand and that of the Hathigumpha inscription on the other, already noted by Bhagabanlal, renders the estimate of Khāravela's date quite untenable' Chanda proceeds to discuss the points of difference and says 'Therefore Śātakarni mentioned in the Hathigumpha inscription should also be identified with Śātakarni II whose reign may be tentatively dated between 75-20 B C.' (Date of Khāravela Jan. Nov. 1919 pp. 215, 216) According to Chanda therefore Bühler's epigraphic estimate is wrong by 100 years

55 *Bhagvanlal Indraji* Discussing the Nasik inscriptions of the Andhra period in Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XVI, 1883, p. 607, Bhagvanlal writes 'If these considerations are kept in view for the whole of India, from the forms of the letters the dates of inscriptions can be determined within a margin of not more than a hundred years'

56 *Rapson* Referring to one of the Bhilsa Topes inscriptions (Sanchi, No. 1, Is. 346) which contains the name Śrī Śātakarni Rapson writes 'He must, in accordance with the epigraphical evidence as interpreted by Bühler, be placed early in the dynasty. Bühler, indeed, proposed to identify him with the Śrī Śātakarni of the Nanaghat and Hathigumpha inscriptions, on the ground that the alphabet of the Bhilsa inscription showed similar characteristics. On the whole, it appears more probable that Bühler was mistaken in assigning so early a date to this inscription, and that this king [Vāsisthīputra] Śrī Śātakarni is to be identified with one of several Śātakarnis who appear later in the puranic lists' (Cca. p. xxiv) The date of Śātakarni of the Hathigumpha inscription is supposed to be 168 B C. and the dates of the later Śātakarnis, with one of whom Rapson proposes to identify the Śātakarni of the Bhilsa inscription, would be any time from, say, 75 A D. to 255 A D. when the Andhra dynasty is supposed to have come to an end. Rapson is inclined to ascribe the Bhilsa inscription to Vīlīvāyakura who, according to him, may be identified with any among kings No. 19,

No 20 and No 21 (Cca pp xxvii, xxviii) Thus according to Rapson Bühler's epigraphic estimate goes wide of the mark by about 250 years

57 *Rapson on Epigraphy as applied to Coins* In discussing the discrepancy between coin and other inscriptional evidence in regard to Cutukulananda Rapson remarks 'From the epigraphical point of view the coins seem to be older than the inscriptions, but it must always be borne in mind that the evidence of epigraphy as applied to coins is at present very uncertain if this view be correct, the coins would be two or three centuries earlier than the inscriptions' (Cca p lxxxv)

58 *Different Readings* The uncertainty that attaches to the epigraphic evidence of dates is often complicated by other factors The same inscription is often read differently by different scholars Taking the Hatigumpha Khāravēla inscription as an example not only did different scholars give different readings of this inscription at different times but even now, when good facsimiles are available, there is no consensus on this subject While Bhagvanlal, Jayaswal, Banerji, Rapson and others are of opinion that the inscription is dated in terms of Muriya era, Fleet, Lüders and others who have followed them think that there is no mention of date in this inscription (The Hatigumpha Inscription J F Fleet Jras 1910 p 825, ls 1345) Numerous other points of difference in reading by different workers are to be found in regard to this inscription In inscriptional and coin legends of western satraps the same name has been read as 'Ghsamotika' by some and as 'Ysamotika' by others (cf Rapson and Bhandarkar) Epigraphical knowledge could not prevent scholars from coming to different opinions even in such an elementary matter as reading a double letter All these considerations would justify the rejection of epigraphic 'evidence' when it comes into conflict with well-supported conclusions from other sources

59 *Persistence of Old Forms of Writing* Certain possible fallacies in connection with epigraphic evidence remain yet to be mentioned It is a matter of everyday observation, in Calcutta at least, that house mottoes are inscribed by illiterate masons in letters the forms of which have been handed down to them by their forefathers One thus comes across a legend in comparatively old type of letters but executed quite recently In State affairs archaic types of writing are likely to persist for a considerable time even when modern forms are current A reference to hand-written legal documents of the present day will afford ample proof in support of the above statement In Nasik caves series of inscriptions are found belonging to different Andhra periods but since they are all distributed about the same place the engraver of the later period

XX Fallacies  
in Epigraphic Evi-  
dence

might conceivably have copied the style of writing of his predecessors

60 *Futility of Epigraphic Evidence* The utter futility of epigraphic evidence will be seen from the following quotations from *Archæological Survey of Western India*, Vol V Bühler writes 'Thirdly, it must be conceded that the characters of the Nanaghat inscriptions belong to period anterior by about 100 years to that of the edicts of Gautamīputra Śātakarnī I and his son Vāsisthīputra Pulumāyī' (p 65) 'Hence the beginning of the Kshatrapa era falls about the middle of the first century B C, and the reign of Gotamīputa Śātakarnī I, who destroyed Nahapāna's power, a little earlier' (p 73) 'Kanha's Nasik inscriptions belong to the first half of the second century B C, i e, were incised between 200-150 B C It agrees with this estimate that the differences between the characters of Gautamīputra Śātakarnī and those of the Nanaghat documents are such that it is not possible to place them, as Pandit Bhagvanlal has also seen, at a distance of more than about 100 years' (p 73) While Buhler definitely places Gautamīputra Śātakarnī a little earlier than 50 B C other scholars like Rapson and Smith have as definitely assigned to him a date as late as 106-130 A D Epigraphic evidence has thus been entirely overthrown It is interesting to note that epigraphic location in time has in this case gone astray by more than 150 years, a period long enough to condemn epigraphy as a false guide to the determination of a dynastic chronology

61 *Risks of relying on Epigraphic Evidence* It is not my contention that epigraphic considerations should be altogether excluded from ancient Indian historical research What I want to emphasize is that extreme care should be taken to admit epigraphic evidence as it stands today in chronological determinations When one finds that on the basis of a mere similarity in names, and that though the name is none too exclusive, the two Śātakarnīs of the Hatigumpha and Nanaghat inscriptions have been regarded as the same person and further they have been sought to be identified with the third Andhra king called Śrī Śātakarnī in some of the purāṇas, one naturally wonders what could have led experienced indologists to support such weak arguments Our surprise becomes all the greater when we find further that the name of the third Andhra king is given as Śrī Śātakarnī only in those purāṇas in which the dynastic list is obviously incomplete so that the true position of the king remains a matter of doubt Further, this doubt leads to the suspicion that an error has been committed when we find that in the more complete list in the Matsyapurāṇa the third name is Śrīmallakarnī and not Śrī Śātakarnī, and that when the different puranic lists are collated it is seen that it is the sixth king and not the third whom the purāṇas mean to designate specifically by the name Śātakarnī It appears that historical scholars who

generally strain at a gnat have swallowed a whole camel in this instance. The reason is not far to seek. Epigraphists have told us that the Hatigumpha and the Nanaghat inscriptions belong to the same period and that these along with the Nasik inscription of king Kanha, whose name appears as second in the puranic list, should be assigned to 'the times of the last Mauryas or the earliest Sungas in the beginning of the second century B C' (Bühler, *Cea* p 12). Once this was admitted it was easy to accept all the arguments mentioned above in spite of their extremely weak character. This was naturally followed by the identification of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni of the Nasik inscriptions with the twenty-third king Gautamīputra of the purāṇas. The name Gautamīputra again is not an exclusive one and might conceivably be applied in conjunction with Śrī Śātakarni to more than one Andhra king. It is on such a weak foundation that the whole structure of modern Andhra chronology has been built up. Epigraphic considerations form its main prop, the illusory strength of which makes us forget the extreme weakness and insecurity of the foundation. I shall presently illustrate by a hypothetical example from English history the risks and pitfalls of the methods that have been employed by modern scholars in the elucidation of Andhra history.

## 6 TWO GROUPS OF DATA

62 *Correlation of Puranic and Inscriptional Data* There are two different groups of available data for working out the history of the Andhras, viz, (1) the puranic records, and (2) the objective materials in the shape of coins and inscriptions. These data may be called the special data without which no connected account of the Andhras can be built up. The two series when properly correlated become complementary to each other. For instance, from the inscriptional and coin records discovered up to date we would never have known without the help of the purāṇas that the kings Simuka, Gautamīputra Śātakarni and the others classed with them belonged to the Andhra dynasty. On the other hand the purāṇas do not mention anything about the exploits of Gautamīputra or of his relation with the western satraps. Literary reference to the Andhras whether indigenous or foreign and tradition, if any, should be considered as external evidence which may support or go against conclusions derived from either of the two special sources mentioned above. It should be noticed that the purāṇas alone make a point of presenting a historical and connected dynastic list, all other data are merely incidental in the sense that they are not the products of an *intention* to preserve history. The function of the historian is, as I have already said, to correlate the different data available from different sources. By the correlation of puranic and

inscriptional data in the case of the Andhras is meant, primarily, the establishment of identity between kings mentioned in the puranic list on the one hand and those mentioned in inscriptions on the other. For the purpose of this discussion I propose to include coin records under inscriptional data. The task of correlation is an extremely difficult one, much more difficult than has been generally supposed. As there are so many pitfalls to avoid in this matter it will be desirable to consider certain broad principles before proceeding to the actual task of identification or of criticism of the results arrived at by modern scholars.

### 63 *The Fourfold Basis of Identity Identity of Names*

XXII Canons for establishing Identity Identity of a puranic king with one mentioned in the inscription may be established on the basis of one or more of four different factors, viz, (i) identity of names, (ii) identity of incidents, (iii) identity of dates, and (iv) identity of places. I shall consider them one by one. When any name in an inscription is found to be identical, either in its entirety or in one or more of its components, with a puranic name in the dynastic list, there is the probability that the two kings are identical. Of the two names, one may be a corrupt or a Prākṛita form while the other a Sanskritic one, e.g., 'king Kanha of the Sātavāhana race' of the inscription has been identified with 'Kṛṣṇa' the second king in the puranic list. Needless to say that the identity established on the basis of a mere similarity of names rests on a very insecure foundation, particularly in the case of kings of ancient India. There have been so many persons belonging to the same or different dynasties bearing the same name that the risks of error in identification are very great. A dated inscription showing the name Surendranath Banerji, for instance, may not at all be connected with the famous Bengali orator of that name, and however great the temptation of a future historian of Bengal may be to identify one with the other it will be obviously absurd to do so. The warning in this matter cannot be too often repeated, as a mere similarity in names unsupported by other reliable considerations has sometimes been considered sufficient to establish an identity. The identification of Śātakarṇi of the Hatigumpha inscription with the third king in the puranic list is an illustration in point.

64 *Identity of Incidents* Identity of incidents may suggest an identity of persons. For instance, if it is found in one series of data that a certain person was anointed king while yet a minor and was killed before attaining majority and in the other series it is found that a king of such and such a name ascended the throne as a minor and was killed immediately afterwards, there would be some grounds for supposing, even in the absence of any name in the first series, that the two persons are identical. Here again it should be remembered that history

has the curious knack of repeating itself in royal families, and similarity of incidents may be a false guide altogether

65 *Identity of Dates and of Places* The strongest basis for identification is the concord of dates between the puranic and the inscriptional series. If independent time records exist on both sides and if there is an agreement between the dates, we shall have found the safest basis for identity. If, for instance, puranic records independently show that king Śrī Śātakarni flourished about 100 A D and if we find in dated inscriptions that king Gautamīputra Śātakarni existed about the same period, then that will be a strong positive evidence of identity of the two persons provided, of course, they can both be located in the same province as well. When the dates and localization agree but the kingly names differ, chances are, provided there is no evidence to the contrary, that the names belong to the same person. The other possibility that we have to keep in mind in such a case is that of joint reign over the same territory by the two persons, this must be a rare occurrence. The most perfect evidence of identity would be a fourfold agreement in time, place, name and incident. It is only seldom that such complete proof can be obtained.

#### 66 *Disagreement between Puranic and Inscriptional Records*

XXIII Amend-  
ing Puranic  
Accounts

Supposing that after an identity has been established beyond dispute, we find a disagreement between the puranic statement and the inscriptional record, the natural presumption would be that the latter gives the correct account. Inscriptions are certainly more reliable than written records like the purāṇas that have been repeatedly transcribed and handed down from generation to generation. There is just the possibility, however, that an inscription might give the wrong version of the story. There is nothing to prevent a king from recording exaggerated and false accounts of his exploits. Such foible is only human. Coming to recent times, it may be pointed out that the truth of the statements recorded in the Black Hole monument in Calcutta has been seriously challenged by honest historians.

67 *Puranic Statements should not be amended* The tendency to discredit a puranic account simply because of its disagreement with deductions possibly of uncertain value drawn from inscriptional evidence is to be strongly deprecated. No one should alter or amend a puranic statement to suit his own ideas. One may, for example, certainly reject altogether the puranic account that Śiśuka the first Andhra king killed Suśarman the last Kaṇva, but one runs the risk of committing a grave error in splitting up the statement and then accepting the first portion of it only and ascribing the act of murder to a later king. A particular puranic statement can only be modified by collation of different readings in the different purāṇas or on the ground of internal inconsistency, even then such an

alteration is a risky procedure as different purāṇas may have given different versions of the same incident and mere collation of different manuscripts will not enable us to arrive at the truth. The Mahābhārata, for instance, gives two different dynastic lists of the Purus in two successive chapters (Adi 94 and 95). These are obviously different versions preserved by the *sūtas* or chroniclers. The puranic and the inscriptional data should of course be critically examined individually and independently of each other before any attempt at correlation is made. Disregard of this rule may lead to trouble. As soon as we correct puranic statements on the strength of inscriptional evidence and *vice versa*, the two series of data cease to be complementary to each other, and if after having made such corrections we proceed to draw conclusions from the joint series of amended material, mistakes and artifacts are inevitable.

68 *Hypothetical English Purāṇa* The following hypothetical example from English history will serve to illustrate the types of mistakes and artificial conclusions that are likely to arise from a neglect of the principles enunciated here.

XXIV Pitfalls  
in Identification  
Hypothetical Illus-  
tration from Eng-  
lish History

Let us suppose that the history of England has not been so well preserved as it actually is and that scholars have to piece together items of information obtained from inscriptions and written accounts of the nature of Indian purāṇas in order to get a connected story of England in the Middle Ages. The supposition of the existence of English purāṇa in a hypothetical example is not so fantastic as might appear at first. The genealogical accounts in the Bible remind one strangely of the Indian puranic dynastic lists. 'And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image, and called his name Seth. And the days of Adam, after he had begotten Seth, were eight hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years and he died. And Seth lived an hundred and five years and begat Enos. And Seth lived, after he begat Enos, eight hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters. And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years, and he died', etc (Genesis V). An Englishman named Thomas Stephens, a priest of the Society of Jesus, who came to India about 1583 A D actually wrote an account of the Old and New Testaments in puranic form in the old Marathi-Konkani poetical language. He called the first part of his book corresponding to the Old Testament 'Pailea Purāṇa' and the second part corresponding to the New Testament 'Dussrea Purāṇa' (J A Saldanha 'The First Englishman in India' jbbbras XXII pp 209-221).

69 *A Hypothetical Account* Let us suppose then for the purpose of our example that English purāṇas written in prophetic



style like the Indian purāṇas exist and that a careful collation of the various readings of the different extant English purāṇas gives the following story

‘Several different dynasties will rule in England during the Middle Ages There will be three kings of the York dynasty, namely Edward, Edward and Richard They will rule this earth for 22 years, 2 months and 2 years respectively The successor of Edward will be under age when he will ascend the throne He

TABLE I HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE

Serial No	ENGLISH PURĀṆA		Dynasty	INSCRIPTION
	Regnal Period	Name and Incidents		Name and Incidents
1	22 Yrs	EDWARD	YORK	EDWARD II
2	2 Mts	EDWARD		1327 A D EDWARD III
3	2 Yrs	RICHARD Close blood relation of Edward Successor of Edward Minor at coronation Murdered by his uncle while yet a minor		RICHARD II Son of Black Prince and grandson of Edward III Successor of Edward III Minor at coronation Killed by his cousin Henry IV
4	24 "	HENRY Relation of Yorkists Killed Richard the last Yorkist First of the Tudor dynasty		HENRY IV Cousin of Richard II Killed Richard II First king of a new dynasty
5	38 "	HENRY	TUDOR	
6	6 "	EDWARD		
7	5 "	MARY		
8	45 "	ELIZABETH Died in 1603 A D End of Tudor dynasty		
	142 "	—Total period of York and Tudor reigns After the Tudors the Stuarts ascended the throne	STUART	1603 A D JAMES I The first Stuart king

The date of king No 2, Edward of the puranic list, is 1327 A D according to the inscription According to the purāṇas 142—22 (the regnal period of king No 1) i.e., 120 years intervened between king No 2, Edward and No 8, Elizabeth Since the date of king No 2 is 1327 A D according to the inscription, Elizabeth must have died in  $(1327 + 120 =) 1447$  A D and not in 1603 A D as stated by the purāṇas The purāṇas obviously confuse the date of death of the last Tudor with the date of accession of the first Stuart king, James I, in 1603 There is really an interval of  $(1603 - 1447 =) 156$  years between Elizabeth and James I as the inscriptional evidence proves This interval is the dark period of English history

TABLE II HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE

Serial No	ENGLISH PURĀṆA		Dynasty	INSCRIPTION
	Regnal Period	Name and Incidents		Name and Incidents
			PLANTAGENET	EDWARD II 1327 A D EDWARD III
			LANCASTER	RICHARD II Son of Black Prince and grandson of Edward III Successor of Edward III Minor at coronation Killed by his cousin later HENRY IV Cousin of Richard II Killed Richard II First king of new dynasty, viz, Lancaster HENRY V HENRY VI
1	22 Yrs	EDWARD IV	YORK	
2	2 Mts	EDWARD V Close blood relation (son) of Edward IV Successor of Edward IV Minor at coronation Murdered by his uncle Richard III while yet a minor		
3	2 Yrs	RICHARD III	TUDOR	
4	24 „	HENRY VII Relation of Yorkists by marriage Killed Richard III the last Yorkist king First of the Tudors		
5	38 „	HENRY VIII		
6	6 „	EDWARD VI		
7	5 „	MARY		
8	45 „	ELIZABETH Died in 1603 End of Tudors Beginning of Stuarts		
			JAMES I	1603 A D

will be murdered while yet a minor at the instigation of his uncle Richard, who will be king after Edward, will be closely related by blood to the latter Henry of the Tudor dynasty, who will be a relation of the Yorkists, will kill the last Yorkist king and will usurp the throne The Tudor reign will come to an end with Elizabeth The interval between the birth of Christ and the death of Elizabeth will be of 1,603 years The first Tudor will rule for 24 years, Henry will rule for 38 years, Edward for 6 years, Mary for 5 years and her sister for 45 years The Yorks and the Tudors will jointly reign for 142 years after which the earth will pass to the Stuart kings'

70 *A Hypothetical Inscription* Let us suppose that in later times an inscription is discovered which records the following

'After Edward II, Edward III ascended the throne of England in 1327 A D He had a son named Black Prince who died while yet a prince Black Prince's minor son Richard II became king after the death of his grandfather Edward III A treacherous cousin of his, Henry by name, killed Richard II and ascended the throne as Henry IV and became the first king of a new dynasty'

71 *Tabulation of the Hypothetical Data* Let us suppose that a scholar in trying to correlate the two accounts tabulates the 'puranic' and inscriptional data side by side (see Tables I and II)

72 *Conclusions from the Hypothetical Data* Our scholar is likely to draw the following deductions

From a comparison of the two columns placed side by side in Table I it is obvious that king No 2, Edward, of the English 'purāṇa' is Edward III of the 'inscription' King No 2, Edward, is said to be a close blood relation of his successor king No 3, Richard, according to the 'purāṇas', also Edward III of the inscription is the grandfather of his successor Richard II, this fits in with the 'puranic' account The successor of Edward who must be king No 3, Richard, of the 'purāṇa' is described as a minor when he ascended the throne, so also Richard II of the 'inscription' was a minor when he became king Then again the successor of Edward and Richard II were both murdered That king No 3, Richard, was the person murdered while yet a minor is supported by the short reign of 2 years ascribed to him in the 'purāṇas' The statement of the English 'purāṇas' that he was murdered by his uncle is obviously wrong as the 'inscription' definitely records that he was murdered by his cousin The purāṇas frequently make mistakes of this type King No 4, Henry, of the 'purāṇas' was the founder of a new dynasty, viz, the Tudor, the 'inscription' shows that Henry IV was also the first king of a new dynasty The correspondence between the 'puranic' and the 'inscriptional' account is perfect There is however one important point in the 'puranic' story that

goes against the 'inscriptional' evidence. From king No 2, Edward, to the death of No 8, Elizabeth, 142 minus 22 (the regnal period of the first king), *i.e.*, 120, years intervened according to the 'purāṇas'. There is no reason to disbelieve this account. Since king No 2 is Edward III of the 'inscription' and since Edward III ascended the throne in 1327 A D according to the same 'inscriptional' record, Elizabeth must have died in  $(1327 + 120 =) 1447$  A D and not in 1603 A D as stated in the English 'purāṇas'. This shows the unreliability of the 'purāṇas'.

73 *Emergence of an Artificial Dark Period in History* Let us suppose that another 'inscription' is found that shows that James I the first Stuart king ascended the throne in 1603 A D. The conclusion is natural that the English 'purāṇas' have ascribed this date to the end of the Tudor dynasty by mistake, this supposition explains the discrepancy between the 'puranic' and the 'inscriptional' time records. It is clear that there is a blank in English history of  $(1603 - 1447 =) 156$  years between the extinction of the Tudors in 1447 A D and the rise of the Stuarts in 1603 A D. This period may be called the dark period in the history of England.

74 *Results of Faulty Correlation of Data* Our hypothetical example has landed us in a pretty mess. Both the 'puranic' account and the 'inscriptional' record are historically absolutely true by themselves but from their faulty correlation and combination has arisen a mass of absurdities the most striking among which is the artifact, namely, the emergence of a dark period in English history which does not really exist. A reference to Table II will show at a glance the different varieties of mistakes that have been committed in the deductions which appear unassailable at first sight. It will be profitable to analyse the different mistakes and the defects in the reasoning that led to them.

75 *Mere Identity of Names is often a False Guide* In the first place it will be noticed that the kings whose names appear in the 'inscription' really preceded the kings of the 'puranic' list. Identity of names has been responsible primarily for the mistaken conclusion that the 'puranic' and the 'inscriptional' records refer to the same series of kings. It is indeed a strange coincidence that the four names of the preceding kings should have been repeated in their exact sequence at a later period. This should serve as a warning to scholars of the risks of placing too much reliance on similarity of names while correlating puranic and inscriptional data.

76 *Identity of Incidents is not a Safe Guide* Similarity of names has been responsible, in the second place, for ascribing the incidents that pertain to king No 2, Edward, of the purāṇas to king No 3, Richard, as both of them could be correctly

described as 'the successor of Edward' This mistake was confirmed by the chance accidents that both king No 2, Edward, of the purāṇa and Richard II of the inscription were minors at coronation and both were killed, one in infancy by his uncle and the other later on by his cousin The 'puranic' account that it was the uncle who instigated the murder of the previous king and the 'inscriptional' record that it was the cousin who had killed the previous king are both true in their respective spheres and it was unwise on the part of our scholar to 'correct' the puranic statement on the strength of the inscriptional record King No 4, Henry, was a relation of the previous king by marriage and was the first of the Tudors while Henry IV of the 'inscription' with whom king No 4, Henry, was wrongly identified, was a cousin of the previous king and was the first of the Lancasters It is again a strange coincidence that both should be the founder of a new dynasty, a fact which helped to consolidate the mistakes of our scholar This should be a warning again to historians that incidents often repeat themselves in royal families

77 *Identity of Uncorrected Dates is a Safe Guide* Had our scholar been careful of the dates in the two series of data and had he placed greater reliance on the puranic account that Elizabeth died in 1603 A D and refrained from 'correcting' the date on the strength of 'inscriptional' evidence he could have avoided all pitfalls Dates therefore form our safest guide in the correlation of puranic and inscriptional data Attempts at any correction of puranic statement of dates lead to serious errors and should never be undertaken if the purāṇas are to be used as a complementary source of information to the inscriptions Of course if anybody happens to be dissatisfied with the puranic version he can reject it altogether and depend on the inscription alone To correct puranic data on the strength of inscriptional evidence and then to apply them to elaborate inscriptional accounts is to say the least of it extremely hazardous as our hypothetical example clearly proves

78 *Possibility of getting Dates from the Purāṇas* It will now be profitable to examine critically the reliability of Andhra chronology as established by modern scholars In Table III I have placed the puranic Andhra data in one column and the corresponding inscriptional and other data in another column This will help us to understand the points of agreement and difference of the two series I have already said that in the absence of independent dates on both the sides no certain conclusions can be arrived at and the identifications cannot be properly tested It is usually believed that (1) although the purāṇas record regnal periods of individual kings

XXV A Com  
parison with  
Andhra Chronology

TABLE III ANDHRA CHRONOLOGY

No	PURĀṆA		INSCRIPTION, ETC	
	Regnal Years	Name and Incident	Regnal Years	Name and Incident (Inferences within brackets)
1	23	ŚIṢṬA First Andhra king Servant of the Kanvas Killed Susarman the last Kanya Father of the third king Śrī Śāta karni		ŚRĪKṢA Nanaghat (Father of Śrī Śātakarni the third king First Andhra king Broke away from Maurya yoke at the same time as Khāravela's grand father Kṣemarāja 230 B C —according to Hatigumpha and epigraphic evidence of Nanaghat)
2	18	KIṢṢA Brother of Simula		KIṢṢA Nasik (Not mentioned in Nanaghat Likely to be brother of Simula)
3	10	ŚRĪ ŚĀTAKARNI		ŚĀTAKARNI Hatigumpha Contem porary of Khāravela —168 B C (Date sup ported by epigraphy)
17	5	HĀLA		HĀLA Literary reference— Saptaśataka (First century A D)
23	21	GAUTAMIPUTRA	24	GAUTAMIPUTRA ŚRĪ ŚĀTAKARNI Nasik and Karle Father of Vāsīthiputra Śrī Pulumāvi (Contem porary of Nandapāna and Rāshadatta, 124 A.D)
24	25	PRĪTĀ	24	VĀSĪTHIPUTRA ŚRĪ PRĪTĀ Bāli—Nasik Guntur (Contemporary of Pulumāvi 150 A.D) Literary refer ence P. 121— 171 A.D In inscriptions the letters were dropped as in Pulumāvi Guntur. Inscriptions are such that the date of the be ginning of the Tri mūrti is 150 A.D which may extend over the time.

There were 30 kings in  
the dynasty reigned  
for 456 years after  
the Kanvas (except  
the end of Kanva at  
28 B C (End of  
Arakha will be 456—  
28=428 A D)

The date 168 B C for the 3rd king Śrī Śātakarni and 150 A.D  
for Gautamiputra and 150 A.D

and the total reigning periods of dynasties they do not mention any specific era by reference to which the chronological points can be determined, (ii) the puranic regnal periods also are supposed to be not very reliable so that it is difficult, if not impossible, to draw up from the dynastic lists any dated table of kings even when fixed chronological points can be found for some of them from other sources I shall show later on that both these statements are entirely wrong Reliable figures for the individual regnal periods can be obtained from puranic records and the dates of individual kings can be fixed as well on the time scale of a specific era provided by the purāṇas For the present purpose of judging the identifications of puranic Andhra kings with those mentioned in inscriptions the approximate date 28 B C assigned by Vincent Smith to the end of the Kaṇva dynasty will be sufficient (Ehṃ p 217 )

79 *The Kings whose Dates are available* In Table III I have mentioned the names of those kings only with regard to whom dates are available either from inscriptions and coins or from literary sources other than the puranic Many of the intermediate puranic kings whose names have not been noted in the table have been identified with more or less success from inscriptional records I have excluded them from my consideration because these records do not give us any indication of dates If two or three definite chronological points can be fixed in the history of the Andhras, these names can be utilized for filling in the intervals, otherwise they have not much significance from the standpoint of chronology

80 *Accepted Identifications Dark Period after the Andhras* It will be noticed from Table III that although on puranic evidence Simuka is accepted as having been the first king of the Andhra dynasty his date has been pushed back considerably by historical scholars The purāṇas intend to place him about 28 B C (if we accept this date as that of the end of the Kaṇva dynasty) while the inscriptional evidence assigns to him a date as early as 230 B C If the latter date be correct naturally Simuka cannot be regarded as the slayer of the last Kaṇva, the purāṇas have therefore been supposed to be wrong in this assertion

three chronological fixed points in the history of the Andhra dynasty The puranic statement that 30 kings ruled for 456 years may be accepted but the purāṇas are obviously wrong in stating that the first Andhra king Śiśuka killed the last Kaṇva king The date of the end of the Kaṇva dynasty is about 28 B C (Ehṃ) while Śiśuka's date according to inscriptional evidence is 230 B C Some later Andhra king might have killed the last Kaṇva The discrepancy in regnal periods of king No 23 between inscriptional and puranic versions is another evidence of the unreliability of the purāṇas Andhra reign ended about (456—230 =) 225 A D According to the purāṇas this date would be (28 B C Last Kaṇva + 456 years =) 428 A D The purāṇas are wrong There is a dark period after the Andhras

Śātakarni, king No 3 of the purāṇas, is believed to be the Śātakarni of Hatigumpha inscription. His date is fixed at 168 B C (19 2) King No 23, Gautamīputra, has been identified with Gantamīputra Śrī Śātakarni of the inscription. His date is found to be about 124 A D on the strength of this identification (19 6a) His son Vāsisthīputra Pulomāvi is naturally identified with Pulomā, king No 24 of the purāṇas. Pulomā was the contemporary of Rudradāman whose inscriptional record shows his date to be 150 A D (19 6b) These three dates only are definitely known in Andhra history. In Mahārāstra the Andhras were displaced by the Traikūtakas. The beginning of Traikūtika era is supposed to be 249 A D, this date roughly corresponds to the end of the Andhra rule (19 8) The total period of Andhra reign is 456 years according to the purāṇas. This figure has been accepted. Since according to scholars the Andhras came into power in 230 B C the dynasty must have ended about  $(456 - 230 =) 225$  A D (19 8) Historians have recorded a dark period after the Andhras (5) According to the puranic account the Andhra rule came to an end 456 years after the death of the last Kanya, i.e., about  $(456 - 28 =) 428$  A D, scholars have not accepted this date for reasons already cited.

SI *Insecure Foundation of Andhra Chronology* If we compare Table III with Table I we shall find that the data in the former offer a ground much less firm for drawing deductions from than those in the latter. Andhra chronology as worked out by modern scholars rests on an extremely insecure foundation and the reliability of deductions drawn therefrom is even less than that of the conclusions arrived at in the hypothetical example cited before and the chances of error far greater in the former. In the example identity was sought to be established on the basis of similarity of names of four successive kings, namely, Edward, Edward, Richard and Henry, all these are personal names and three of them are dissimilar so that the chances of an accidental coincidence here are far less than in the Andhra list where only two successive kings could be identified by their names, namely, Gautamīputra and Pulomā, of these two names again Gautamīputra is a gotra name and may be applied as well to other kings besides No 23. There are several Pulomās in the puranic list and nothing to indicate who is who. The identification of Śātakarni of the Hatigumpha inscription with Śrī Śātakarni, king No 3, rests on a basis much weaker than that in the case of either Gautamīputra or Pulomā. In the first place Śātakarni is a clan name and may be applied with equal justification to almost all the members of the Andhra dynasty. There might have been other Śātakarnis as well who were not Andhras. Then again grave doubts exist whether the third name in the puranic list is at all Śātakarni. The date of Khāravela himself, the contemporary of Hatigumpha Śātakarni, also is in



dispute Some epigraphists are of opinion that there is no mention of any date in the inscription The uncertainty of epigraphic evidence regarding possible dates minimizes the value of support from Nanaghat and Nasik inscriptions in this matter The statement that Simuka was the father of Hatigumpha Śātakarni is nothing more than a guess The relation of Simuka to Śātakarni of the Nanaghat inscription also is open to different interpretations Bhagvanlal's opinion that these two stand in the relation of father and son is again a mere conjecture Simuka's image in the cave might well have been placed first because he was the founder of the royal dynasty, and the second image with the legend 'Śātakarni' might very well be a representation of a later king belonging to the same family (181)

82 *Comparison with the Hypothetical Example* A comparison of Table III showing Andhra chronology with Table I of the hypothetical example from English history brings out a striking likeness between the two The methods employed in establishing Andhra chronology are almost identical with the methods illustrated in the example, and the deductions also show similar characteristics In both we find that identifications have been effected not on the basis of dates but on that of similarity of names Incidents and dates belonging to the puranic series have been corrected on the strength of the inscriptional evidence in both the instances and then the data thus amended have been utilized in the elaboration of the inscriptional account In both the tables we find that the entire series of puranic kings has been pushed back in time in complete disregard of chronology as stated in the purānas, with the result that a blank has appeared in later historical account The most striking point of resemblance between the two instances is the emergence of this dark period in the wake of the dynasty

83 *Suspicion of some Grave Error in Andhra Chronology*

XXVI Attitude  
of Scholars towards  
the Purānas

The above considerations raise the suspicion that a grave error has been committed in the identification of Andhra kings and that the chronology requires revision I have repeatedly insisted on the fact that in the absence of dates on the puranic side it is impossible to test the identifications effectively So before trying to locate any error that might exist in the accepted Andhra chronology it is desirable to find out whether we could get dates of the Andhras from the purānas, dates that would be free from internal inconsistency If we succeeded in fixing puranic dates for the Andhra kings independently of inscriptional or other evidence, we could easily appraise the identifications by modern scholars, and in case of any discrepancy discovered between the puranic and the inscriptional account we could reject one or the other according to the demands of probability.

84 *Onus of Proof for Puranic Statements* Unless, as mentioned just now, independent dates are available on both sides no correlation of any value can be established between puranic and inscriptional accounts. Unfortunately modern scholars think that the purāṇas stand on unreliable ground so that for every puranic statement an objective proof is sought before it is admitted. For instance, when anybody asserts on puranic authority that Rāmacandra ruled in Ayodhyā in remote times the historians are unwilling to accept this statement unless inscription or coin or some such solid objective evidence is forthcoming. The onus of proof that Rāmacandra existed lies here with the person who makes the assertion. On the other hand, when the modern scholar says merely on the strength of written evidence that there was a king named Harold in England in ancient time no 'solid' proof in the shape of inscriptions and coins is demanded from him, the generally prevalent attitude is one of belief in this case, if anybody happens to doubt the correctness of this statement the onus of proof that Harold did not exist is thrown on him.

85 *Attitudes of Belief and Disbelief in the Choice of Historical Material* This general attitude either of belief or of disbelief on the part of a historian towards written accounts is mainly responsible for his choice or rejection of materials from such sources for historical purpose. For example, the modern historian, while rejecting the portions containing obviously absurd and exaggerated descriptions, has accepted in the main the accounts of Greek writers like Megasthenes even when corroborative evidence is wanting, the general attitude is one of belief towards Greek accounts. On the contrary, in the case of the purāṇas not only are the absurd portions discarded but practically nothing is admitted unless supported by external evidence or unless the account serves to support conclusions drawn from other sources. The purāṇas, owing to the prevalent attitude of disbelief towards them, have thus been given no intrinsic historical status. The result has been that scholars have always tried to fit the puranic account into their own findings, and no attempt has been made in the reverse direction, namely, to fit inscriptional records into puranic statements by any scholar of repute up to the present time. Had this been done in the case of the Andhras quite a different series of identifications would have been effected, and a worthier and, I would venture to say, more reliable chronology would have been established.

86 *Bühler and the Purāṇas* The attitude of modern scholars towards purāṇas in general, and puranic chronology in particular, is best summed up in the words of Bühler. He writes 'Further, as regards the Purāṇas their aim is to bring the history of India into the frame of the Yuga theory. For this purpose their authors have to pile dynasty on dynasty in order

to fill a space of many thousand years. Historical research has shown that they possessed *some* reliable information not only as to names, but even as to years. In the case of the Andhra dynasty, the coins and inscriptions prove that the order in which the corrupt forms of the names Gautamīputra Śātakarni, Pulumāyi, Sakasena (*Srisena*) Mātharīputra, and Gautamīputra Yajñaśrī Śātakarni are given, is perfectly correct, as well as that Simuka, Krishna and Śātakarni reigned a considerable time before the former princes, and followed each other closely. But it by no means follows that all the other names or the order in which they are given are reliable. Nor is there any guarantee that the dynasty of Simuka-Śipraka ruled during about 450 years, much less that Simuka-Śipraka reigned 350 or 360 years before Gautamīputra Śātakarni I. All these points have to be proved. Though I think it right and necessary, therefore, to look to the Purāṇas for the kings mentioned in the inscriptions, I deny the possibility of making up a chronological account of the Andhras with their help. It seems to me that the only means for approximatively fixing the age of the group of kings—(1) Simuka, (2) Krishna, (3) Śātakarni—and of that containing (1) Gotamīputa Śātakarni, (2) Pulumāyi, (3) Sakasena Mādhari-puta, (4) Gotamīputa Sriyana Śātakarni, and (5) Chandasri, are epigraphic evidence, and the synchronisms with the Western Kshatrapas who date according to an era, not according to regnal years' (aswī Vol V pp 72, 73)

87 *Modern Scholars and the Purāṇas* It is true that latter-day historians have accepted, as it suited their own findings or fancy, some of the puranic statements that were rejected by Bühler, but it must be admitted that the general attitude of disbelief towards the purāṇas remains unaltered to this day. It is not my intention here to establish the authenticity of the purāṇas in general, what I want to stress is the fact that the purāṇas have given us a chronology of the Andhras that is free from internal inconsistencies and that is well-supported from several directions by the purāṇas themselves, and as such the chronology is worthy of our careful attention.

88 *Preparation of Puranic Urtext is not possible* Certain

XXVII Collec-  
tion of Puranic  
Data Methods of  
Interpretation

general rules will have to be observed in collecting data from the purāṇas. Since the purāṇas differ from one another and since even the different manuscripts of the same purāṇa may differ in certain respects, collation of texts and a critical and careful selection are necessary before we can get materials suitable for our purpose. Some scholars are of opinion that all the purāṇas may be traced to a common source and it is therefore possible to prepare an urtext that might be supposed to be free from interpolations and errors of scribes. I do not subscribe to this view. It is true that there are certain portions in certain purāṇas that have a common

origin, but even a casual glance at the contents of the different purāṇas will convince anybody that they had different sources to draw from and that each of them has some special topic not found in the others. The dynastic lists in many of the purāṇas show evidence of having individual and independent sources. Under these circumstances artificially prepared urtexts are likely to be misleading as the different readings very often represent different versions of the same account. Mere collation of texts is not likely to enable us to choose the correct versions. Other critical methods will have to be employed to find out which form among the different readings is likely to give us a correct statement of affairs. I should like to emphasize again that inscriptional and other considerations should not be brought in to find out the correct text if we intend to correlate the two series of puranic and inscriptional data. It will not be wise to go beyond the purāṇas for deciding the correct version. In dynastic and chronological matters the purāṇas often provide us with different types of information so that from a consideration of these it is generally possible to decide which is to be accepted and which rejected. The text of any particular purāṇa should certainly be settled by collation of different manuscripts of the same purāṇa.

89 *Different Names for the same King* To come to specific questions in Andhra chronology it may be stated that no effort should be made to correct the names of kings by a comparison of the different records in the different purāṇas. I have already cited the instance of a king of the Puru dynasty who has been called under various names, viz., Adhisīnakṛṣṇa, Adhisāmakṛṣṇa, Adhisomakṛṣṇa and Asīmakṛṣṇa. It is evident that the king could not possibly have all these four names. It is however impossible to determine which is the correct name of the king. Collation of manuscripts will not help us in this matter and the preparation of an urtext is likely to give a misleading information. The best plan is to leave these names alone till fresh evidence is forthcoming. After all it does not very much matter for historical purpose which is the real name of a king among many variants. In India, particularly in the case of educated families, the general tendency has been from time immemorial to allot meaningful names to persons. These names are generally Sanskritic. Even now one finds the same tendency in different parts of India and more particularly in Bengal. In actual use these Sanskritic names are very often abbreviated and corrupted. For instance, 'Debendra' becomes 'Deben', 'Profulla' becomes 'Pipu' and so on as Robert becomes Bob, Thomas Tom and John Jack. The same thing must have happened in ancient India also, that is why Sanskritic forms like 'Śātakarni', 'Kṛṣṇa', etc. have appeared in records in their Prakritic forms 'Sātakarni' or 'Sātakamni' or even in the abbreviated form 'Sāta', 'Kaṇha',

etc. It may be deemed justifiable therefore to change the Prākṛitic forms into Sanskritic ones in historical accounts. Nothing more than this should be allowed. The different forms of names should be left untouched and for the purpose of writing historical accounts any one of these, preferably the most common one, may be used.

90 *Andhra Dynastic List* The Andhra dynastic list is not to be found in its complete form in any of the purāṇas. The number of kings is stated to be thirty and there is some amount of agreement on this point. The Radcliffe copy of the Matsya-purāṇa, as quoted by Wilson, gives 29 names, Fitzedward Hall has supplied the missing name from his copy of Matsya. Wilford's Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa, quoted by Wilson, mentions 24 names. The editions and manuscripts of Viṣṇupurāṇa, that I have seen, give 24 names only. The Bhāgavat has 23 names and the Ānandāśram edition of Vāyu contains 15 or probably 16 names, some manuscripts of Vāyu mention a few more.

91 *Andhras and Andhrabhrtyas* From the lists from which several names have been omitted it is difficult to fix the position of individual kings mentioned therein in the complete series of thirty and mistakes are likely to occur. The safest guide will be to rely on the most complete list available and that is the Radcliffe Matsya list. The names occurring in the other purāṇas may best be arranged taking the Radcliffe list as the standard. There is one name short in the Radcliffe manuscript referred to above. The missing name and its position can be easily determined by comparison with other lists. There emerges the twentieth king Sundara Śātakarṇi. Hall in his note to Wilson's reproduction of Radcliffe's list says, as already pointed out, that his own copy gives the name of the twentieth king as Sundara-Swātikarṇa (Vip-w IV 24 p 201 n). The Matsya seems to distinguish between true Andhras and Andhrabhrtyas among the 30 kings. According to the Matsya there were 19 true Andhras (Mtp-a 273 16).

92 *Unanimity in the Purāṇas regarding the first Andhra King* Fortunately, the purāṇas do not give us different versions of any incident pertaining to any Andhra king. All are unanimous in saying that the first Andhra king killed the last Kāpya. We may therefore accept this as a definite puranic statement. Whether it is true or false is quite another matter and has to be decided by other evidence.

93 *Determination of Puranic Regnal Periods* The names of the Andhra kings and their respective positions in the puranic dynastic list do not offer so much difficulty as the fixing of the individual regnal period for each. There is so much discrepancy to be found in the different purāṇas and in the different manuscripts of the same purāṇa that at first sight it seems hopeless that connected and reliable reckonings can be at all obtained.

that may with justice be avowed as puranic. The task, however, is not an impossibility if we remember that the purāṇas give total periods of dynastic reigns besides regnal years for individual kings. Regarding the duration of the total periods there is more unanimity than in that of the individual regnal periods. Very often the regnal years when added together do not tally with the total dynastic period. It may be assumed that the total periods give reliable and correct figures while the regnal periods contain errors that may be traced to various causes. The supposed error, however, may not be an error at all. The Vāyu mentions, for instance, that the Śiśunāka dynasty ruled for the total period of 362 years, but the individual regnal years when added together give 332 years only. There is a discrepancy of 30 years which has to be accounted for. It is absurd to suppose that the author of these statements could not even notice this simple arithmetical mistake and allowed it to stay on. Sometimes this sort of discrepancy has been adduced as proof of the unreliability of the purāṇas. More charitably disposed scholars have ascribed such 'mistakes' to scribes and have tried to correct them. These discrepancies are not to be regarded as errors, they are deliberate statements the reason for which may be easily found in most cases by a careful reading of the text.

94 *Durations of Reigns of Śiśunākas and Mauryas* It has been said of the Śiśunākas that they ruled in Benares before they usurped the imperial throne (Vap-a 93 315). Apparently the Śiśunākas were independent kings at Benares for 30 years before they became paramount. It is because of this that in the successive lists of paramount rulers the Śiśunākas have been allotted a reign of 332 years while as a dynasty they are said to have ruled as independent kings for 362 years. The Vāyupurāṇa is therefore not at all inconsistent in this matter, on the other hand, the apparent inconsistency, when interpreted in the light of the text, gives us valuable historical information. Similarly the discrepancy of 5 years between the summed-up regnal periods and the total period of reign of the puranic Mauryas may be explained on the supposition that Candragupta the conqueror of the Nandas ruled in the Punjab as an independent king for 5 years. A reference to Table IV will clearly show the consistency of the puranic chronology. The discrepancies, as I have said, can be satisfactorily explained in the majority of cases on the authority of the purāṇas themselves, they will then be seen to yield valuable historical information, *vide* notes to Table IV.

95 *Omissions and Unjustified Additions* Omissions and unjustified additions in the list of kings for any dynasty can be satisfactorily adjusted in most cases by comparing the different purāṇas which usually show unanimity in their statements of the number of kings for each dynasty. Sometimes one or more

regnal periods would be missing. They can be supplied from more complete lists in other purāṇas. When the purāṇas differ in their statements of regnal periods a choice has to be made from among the contending versions. No correction of any regnal period in any purāṇa is justifiable. We can make a choice for our required list from among different versions. The convenient and plausible explanation of mistakes in transcription should not be a justification to alter puranic data to suit our requirements. The only exception is the case in which different readings are found in different manuscripts of the same purāṇa, in such circumstances, provided the errors of the scribe can be detected with certainty, corrections can be introduced into the copies giving a wrong version.

96 *Total Dynastic Reign as a Guide in selecting Individual Regnal Periods* When different purāṇas give different regnal periods for the same king our choice should be guided by a reference to the total reigning period of the dynasty. The figures that give a correspondence between the summed-up regnal years and the recorded total period should be accepted. If no manuscript gives the required figure, it will be wise to acknowledge a failure. A forced correspondence produced by modifying puranic figures on the assumption of a copyist's mistake is to be strongly deprecated. Let me repeat again that one may accept or reject a puranic statement but nobody has the right to amend it. To cite an illustration, although it has been stated that there were 10 kings in the Maurya dynasty, only 9 kings with corresponding 9 regnal periods have been recorded in the Vāyu. The name of the missing king can be supplied from either the Visṇu or the Matsyapurāṇa which latter gives a list which is, however, very incomplete. The king has been called Sangata in the Visṇu and Saptati in the Matsya. The regnal period for this king in the Matsya is 9 years. This may be accepted to fill up the gap in the Vāyu. Even now we find that the summed-up regnal periods come up to only 132. The Visṇu, Vāyu and Matsya are unanimous in stating that the Mauryas ruled for 137 years. Our figure thus falls short of the required number of 137 by 5. Aśoka's regnal years have been mentioned as 26 by certain manuscripts of the Vāyu and as 36 in other manuscripts. The last figure is given by the Matsya also. If we now replace the Vāyu figure of 26 by the Matsya figure of 36 we get the total of 142 years. This again goes wide of the mark by an excess of 5. No amount of manipulation of the figures available from the different purāṇas will enable us to make the figures tally. If we assume, as I have indicated before, that Candragupta ruled for five years in some province as an independent king before he came to occupy the imperial throne we get over the difficulties. It is true that this assumption is not supported by any puranic text in so many words, if, however, we remember the definite statements of the purāṇas in similar cases in other dynasties, we

need have no hesitation in accepting the supposition. The Vāyu states that Kauṭilya after having ousted the Nandas installed 'King' Candragupta on the throne. Candragupta was thus already a king when he came to Magadha (Vap. a. 99. 331). Had no purāṇa mentioned Aśoka's regnal period as 36 we would not have been justified in introducing the figure, however great the temptation might have been to do so. A dynastic list can be called puranic only when it is based on the purāṇas. No figure should be introduced in drawing up a list in any case unless it has the authority of one of the purāṇas at least.

97. *Māgadhas, Sūtas and Purāṇakāras*. The methods of puranic interpretation that I have discussed here get support from the purāṇas themselves. There were three types of historical chroniclers in ancient India, viz., the 'māgadhas', the 'sūtas' and the 'purāṇakāras'. Every king used to maintain a māgadha in his court. The function of the 'māgadha' was to keep a record of the events of the reign of his master and of those of the preceding kings of the same dynasty. The 'māgadha' was the local State chronicler and it is conceivable that his records were often biased towards his master. The 'sūtas', on the other hand, were in nobody's employ, they visited different countries and courts and faithfully recorded what they saw or heard and thought to be true history. 'Sūtāḥ paurāṇikāḥ prokta māgadhā vamsabedanāḥ' (śloka quoted by Śrīdhara in his commentary on Viṣṇupurāṇa), i.e., the 'sūtas' were recorders of puranic facts (history) while the 'māgadhas' were familiar with the events of individual dynasties. The functions and qualifications of the 'sūtas' have been described in Vāyu 1. 31-32, 4. 8, 99. 213, Matsya 164. 16-18, Brahmānda 1. 21 and in various other places. According to these descriptions the sūtas were learned, intelligent and truthful persons who could be relied upon and who faithfully recorded according to their individual capacities and without any alteration what they saw or heard (yathāśakti, yathāvrittāntam, yathādrīṣṭam, yathāśāśvadam, yathāśrutam). It was their duty (svadharma) to record the genealogies of 'gods', kings and ṛṣis. The sūtas travelled about from place to place in search of historical information, and recited their records before learned ṛṣis assembled at the performance of yajñas. The 'purāṇakāras' or the actual authors of the purāṇas were mostly ṛṣis, they came to the yajñas for the purpose of hearing the sūtas who were expected to be present at the functions. The 'purāṇakāras' also recorded faithfully for their books.



Prabhās 44 27) This fact would explain the peculiar variations of the same śloka in the different purāṇas. The sound-resemblance among the different readings is remarkable and can only be explained by the supposition that the different recorders heard the same person differently because the latter's voice happened to be indistinct at the time or because it was drowned to some extent in other noises. In an emergency of this type the individual purāṇakāras tried to maintain the sound-forms of the sūta's reading intact, at the same time keeping in mind the needs of grammar. A comparison of the ślokas Viṣṇu IV 24 45-48, Vāyu 99 437-440 and Matsya 273 55-58 will show what frantic efforts the different purāṇakāras made to maintain the same sound-form while trying to avoid errors of facts and of grammar (Ppv pp 180-194). The preparation of an urtext for such passages only may be a justifiable procedure although it may not be possible in all cases. The absurd theory that big volumes of purāṇas were transmitted from generation to generation solely by being committed to memory cannot be applied here as the facts recorded in the ślokas refer to a time when, even according to the most ardent exponent of the 'memory theory', the art of writing must have been well established. Among the different auditory variations there is no reason why one version should be given preference over others for the purpose of correction. The puranic account is therefore not to be touched in any way. 'Vedabanniscalam manye purāṇam bai dvijottamah' (Skp-b Prabhās 2 90), i.e., 'O learned brāhmaṇas, the purāṇas are considered to be as fixed as the Vedas themselves'. Although the purāṇas, as written by the purāṇakāras, are inviolable, there is nothing to prevent the 'purāṇārthakāra' or the interpreter of the purāṇas from rejecting one version or the other, after consideration of the different purāṇas, or from offering his own explanations of facts. The intention of the purāṇakāras is that the original sources should be left untouched.

## 7 PURANIC CHRONOLOGY

99 *Viṣṇu, Vāyu and Matsya suffice in drawing up a connected Chronology* If we follow the methods of

XXVIII Puranic Chronology puranic interpretation discussed above, it will be possible to draw up a connected chronological story that may be deemed avowedly 'puranic' by consulting the easily available printed editions of Viṣṇu, Vāyu and Matsya. These three should suffice and there would be no need to hunt after the manuscripts of all the extant purāṇas for this purpose. It is possible that variations might be discovered regarding minor details in other purāṇas but they will in no way affect the validity of the main conclusions drawn from the three sources mentioned here. Even if a different, connected and consistent story can be built up from other

manuscripts or from other purāṇas, the possibility of any of which I deny however, it can be considered as a different version of puranic chronology and it would then be desirable to consider which is to be accepted. So long as such a different version is not forthcoming we may safely adopt the puranic account given here for the purposes of history.

100 *Andhra Chronology as Part of a Bigger Scheme* The puranic Andhra chronology is to be considered not as an isolated affair but as a part of a bigger scheme that would include the preceding dynasties as well. This will bring out the wonderful consistency of the puranic account and will help us to understand the strength of the puranic evidence and its reliability. After such a table has been prepared it will be time to make an effort to correlate it with inscriptional and other data. To economize space I have arranged the puranic data in tabular form. The justification of selecting a particular figure from variants will be apparent from a close inspection of the table and of the figures for accepted total periods of dynastic reigns. The remarks and notes appended to the tables will also serve to explain the choice. I have made no effort in the tables to determine the correct names of kings. I consider this to be an impossible task in the present state of our knowledge. It will be seen that the Viṣṇupurāṇa does not give regnal periods for individual kings. The list of 30 Andhra kings is in accordance with the Radcliffe copy quoted by Wilson and amended by Hall. The dates in Christian era have been fixed in accordance with the accepted regnal years and on the assumption that Nanda's coronation took place 401 years before Christ. The grounds for this supposition have been discussed in connection with the reference era of the purāṇas. The date of Nanda's coronation is the key-date in later puranic chronology. (120-131)





TABLE IV PURANIC REGNAL YEARS AND CHRONOLOGY—continued

King No	NAMES OF PURANIC KINGS			REGNAL YEARS			Total years	Date b C	Notes
	Vip-a	Vap a	Mtp a	Vap	Mtp	Accepted			
	<i>Maurya</i>								
1	Candragupta outside Magadha			24		5	5	320	Matsya does not mention the order of succession of the Mauryas
2	Candragupta			25		19		315	
	Bindusāra					25		296	
3	Asokavardhana			26	36	36		271	Vap a kha gha 99 332 n 27 give 36 years as Asoka's regnal period
4	Suyāsa	Asoka Kuna		8		8		235	
5				8	8	8	137	227	The summed up regnal periods of the Mauryas give 142 years while the dynastic reign is stated to be 137 years. The discrepancy of 5 years is to be explained by the assumption that Candragupta was an independent king for this period before he ousted the Nandas of Magadha (96)
6	Daśaratha	Bandhupālita	Daśaratha	10	9	9		219	
7	Sāngata		Saptatī			10		210	
8	Śālisūka	Indrapālita		7		7		200	
9	Somaśarman	Devavarmā		8	6	8		193	
10	Satadhanvan	Satadhar	Satadhanvā	7	7	7		185	
	Bhadratha	Bhadasva	Bhadratha's son		70			178	
				123	136	142	142		
	Stated No	9	10						
	Total years	137	137						



TABLE IV PURANIO REGNAL YEARS AND CHRONOLOGY—continued

King No	NAMES OF PURANIC KINGS			REGNAL YEARS			Total years	Date	Notes	
	Vip w	Vap-a	Mtp-a	Vap	Mtp	Accepted				
	Andhras									
1	Śipruka	Sindhuka	Śisūka	23	23	23	}	b C	The complete list of Andhra kings is to be found in Radcliffe manuscript quoted by Wilson and amended by Hall in Vip w IV p 201 n	
2	Kṛṣṇa	Bhāta	Kṛṣṇa	18	18	18		a C 2		
3	Śrī Sātākarni		Śrī Mallakarni		18	18		20		
4	Pūrnotsanga		Pūrnotsanga		18	18		38		
5	Sātākarni	Śrī Sātākarni	Śrīvasvāni	50	18	18	}	56	The 5th king is called Skandhaśambhi in Hall's manuscript Also called Dvivilaka	
6	Lambodara		Sātākarni		50	56		74		
7	Ivllaka		Lambodara		18	18		130		
8	Meghasvāti	Āpūdobadha	Āpitaka	40	12	12		148		
9			Sengha		18	18		160		
10			Sātākarni		18	18		178		
11			Skandhasvāti		7	7		196		
12			Migendra		3	3		203		
13			Kuntalasvāti		8	8		206		
14			Kuntalasvāti		8	8		206		
15	Paṭumat		Svātākarna		1	1		214		
16	Arjṣṭakarnan	Nemikṛṣṇa	Pulomāvit		36	36		213		
17	Hāla	Hāla	Gorakṣāsūśvāri	25	25	25		251		Also called Gorakṣa-kṛṣṇa
18	Pattalaku	Septaka	Hāla	1	5	5		276		
19	Pravīllasonu	Putrikaṣena	Mantallaka	21	5	5		281		There were 19 Andhra kings (Mtp a 27) 16-18)
			Purindrasena		5	21		286		





TABLE V SYNOPSIS TABLE OF DYNASTIC REIGNING PERIODS

Dynasty	Purāṇa	Stated number of Kings	Number of names recorded	Stated dynastic reign in years	Sum of recorded regnal years	Reference
Pradyotas	Vip w	5	5	138	148	IV 24, pp 178, 179
	Vap a	5	5	138	155	99 314
	Mtp a	5	5	152 ?		272 5
Śśūnākas	Vip w	10	10	362	332	IV p 182
	Vap a	10	10	362	344	99 321
	Mtp a	12	12	360		272 13
Nandas	Vip w	9	2	100	40 + 2	IV pp 185, 186
	Vap a	9	2	100	100	99 330
	Mtp a	9	2	100		272 22
Mauryas	Vip w	10	10	137	123	IV p 190
	Vap a	9	9	137	136	99 336
	Mtp a	10	6	137		272 26
Śūngas	Vip w	10	10	112		IV p 192
	Vap a	10	9	112	136	99 342, 343
	Mtp a	10	9	300 ?	102	272 31, 32
Kanvas	Vip w	4	4	45	55	IV p 193
	Vap a	4	4	45	45	99 346, 347
	Mtp a	40	4	45		272 32 36
Andhras	Vip w	30	24	456	269½	IV pp 199, 200
	Vap a	30	16	456	436½	99 357, 358
	Mtp a, Vip-w	19+7+2	29+1	460		-a 273 17, 18, Vip w IV p 201

TABLE VI STATED INTERVALS

Intervals	Purāna	Years	Reference
From birth of Parīkṣit to Mahāpadma Nanda's coronation	Vip w Vap a Mtp a	1,015 1,050 1,050	IV p 229 99 415 273 36
From Mahāpadma Nanda's coronation to the end of the Andhras	Vip Vap a Mtp a	836 836	99 416, 417 273 37, 38

101 *Twofold check for Regnal Periods* From an examination of Tables Nos IV, V and VI it will be seen that a perfectly consistent chronological account of the later puranic kings can be made out from the puranic records. It is possible to do so in spite of different readings of regnal years because of a twofold check provided by the purāṇas themselves. In the first place there is a remarkable unanimity among the purāṇas in their statements of the number of kings for each dynasty and for the total period of the dynastic reign. The total figure enables us to choose the regnal periods correctly from among a number of variants when they exist. Where there is a discrepancy between the total period and the properly chosen summed-up regnal years, as in the cases of the Śiśunākas and the Mauryas, it may be assumed that the succeeding dynasty came from a different province where it had already been independent for the time indicated by the difference. Usually the purāṇas have given the proper hint in such cases. The second check lies in the stated intervals. The relevant different total dynastic reigns when added together should tally with the stated interval.

102 *Nanda as Regent* If we add the puranic successive dynastic periods from Nanda to the end of the Andhras we get (Nandas—88 years+Mauryas—137 years+Sungas—112 years+Kanvas—45 years+Andhras—456 years =) 838 years. But Vāyu (99 416, 417) and Matsya (273 36-38) both state that there is an interval of 836 years between Nanda's coronation and the end of the Andhras. The discrepancy of (838-836 =) 2 years is to be explained on the supposition that Nanda acted as the regent of his father Mahānandī during the last 2 years of the latter's reign. I first made this suggestion in my book *Purāṇa-praveśa* (pp 97, 134, 153, 154) in 1934. Since then the publication of *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* by Jayaswal has strikingly confirmed the supposition by the statement that Nanda was the *mantri* of Mahānandī for some time before his kingship (Ślokas 422-424). Besides these two checks, the application of which will be apparent from Tables IV and V, the purāṇakāras have mentioned yet another chronological control.

103 *Cycle of 2,700 Years* The purāṇakāras thought that it required a hundred generations to cover a period of 27 centuries (Vap-a 99 418) They devised a century scale on this basis and called it the Saptarṣi Cycle The Saptarṣi Cycle consisted of 2,700 years divided into centuries The centuries were named according to the 27 stellar constellations The cycle was called the Saptarṣi Cycle from the convention that the straight line passing through the mid-point of the line connecting the first two stars of the Ursa Major or the Saptarṣi and the pole, when prolonged, was supposed to travel across the 27 constellations, one by one, taking 100 years to cover each The idea originated in the observed movement of this line as a result of the precession of the equinoxes The actual amount of this movement does not, however, correspond to the conventional movement of the Saptarṣi line that is supposed to demarcate the stellar centuries Anyway, the convention of the Saptarṣi Yuga was a recognized time scale Primarily the Saptarṣi Cycle was counted from 'Jyēsthā', literally the 'eldest' constellation Later on the first point or epoch was shifted to 'Aśvinī' which was called the first century (Ppv pp 86-) To distinguish the two methods of counting the first is called the 'prayuga' and the second 'navayuga' or simply 'saptarṣi yuga' in the purāṇas It is stated both in the Vāyu (99 418) and in the Matsya (273 39) that the Saptarṣi Cycle will end and begin again at the time of the Andhra dynasty

104 *The end of the Saptarṣi Cycle during the Andhra Period* The two ślokas, referred to here, offer certain difficulties in explanation I have consulted several learned pundits regarding grammar, syntax and meaning of the ślokas which I quote here for ready reference The *anvaya* and the meaning given here have been suggested by the pundits I consulted The Vāyu śloka runs

Saptarṣayastadā prāhuḥ pratipe rājñi bai śatam  
Saptavimśaiḥ śatairbhābyā andhrānām te tvayā punah  
(Vap a 99 418)

The *anvaya* is Andhrānām (kāle) śatam (samkhyah) rājñi pratipe bai tadā punah te saptarṣayah saptavimśaiḥ śataiḥ tvayā bhābyāḥ (iti) prāhuḥ (śrutarsayah) The meaning is 'During the time of the Andhras, when counting backwards, a hundred kings will have passed away, the saptarṣis, you should know, will begin again for 27 centuries, so say the sages' The Matsya śloka is as follows

Saptarṣayastadā prāmśu pradiptenāgninā samāḥ  
Saptavimśati bhābyānām andhrānām tu yadā punah  
(Mtp a 273 39)

The *anvaya* is Yadā saptavimśati bhābyānām andhrānām (kālah) tadā tu punah saptarṣayah pradiptenāgninā samāḥ

prāmsu (bhavisyanti) The meaning is 'During the time of the future 27 Andhra kings the saptarṣis will rise high again like flaming fire'

If instead of reading 'saptarṣisatibhāvyānām' we read 'saptarṣisatirbhāvyānām', the *anvaya* would be Yādā bhāvyānām andhrānām (kālā) tadā prāmsu pradiptenāgninā samāh saptarṣisatir saptarṣayah punah (bhavisyanti), i.e., 'During the time of the future Andhras the twenty-seven saptarṣis that rise like high flaming fire will begin their course again'

Whichever version of the Vāyu and the Matsya sloka we accept the meaning is clear that a new Saptarṣi Cycle began during the time of the Andhras

105 *The Kali Yuga* According to the purāṇas Nanda's period falls within the 'pūrvaśādhā' century (Vip-w IV p 234) Pūrvaśādhā century is the 20th navayuga Parikṣit's time is the maghā century (Vip-w IV p 233), i.e., the 10th navayuga There are still other time cycles to be considered There is a time scale in the purāṇas which may be called the Dharma Yuga This consists of four periods, viz., kṛta, tṛtīā, dvāpara and kali, the respective durations of these are in the ratio of 4 3 2 1 Thus manner of division on the 'dharma' scale may be applied to any yuga or cycle For historical records the purāṇakāras further conceived of a short yuga of 5 years (Vip-w II p 255) A thousand such yugas, i.e., 5,000 years, constituted a kalpa This cycle of 5,000 years was divided on the dharma scale, i.e., it comprised a kṛta of 2,000 years, a tṛtīā of 1,500 years, a dvāpara of 1,000 years and a kali of 500 years Each of these is supposed to begin and end with a transition period of as many months as the years of the division itself Thus dvāpara ends with a transition period of 1,000 months and kali begins with one of 500 months I made a full discussion of these time scales in my book 'Purāṇapraveśa'

106 *The Maghā Century and the Kali* It is said in the Mahābhārata (Ādi 2 13) that the war between the Kurus and the Pāṇavas took place when the transition periods between dvāpara and kali were over, i.e., 500 months or about 42 years after kali started This is the year of Parikṣit's birth as well The purāṇas state that the maghā century of the Saptarṣi Cycle and the kali of the Kalpa Cycle started at the same time (Vip-w IV p 233, Bgp 6 122 31) According to Viṣṇu the interval between Parikṣit's birth and Nanda's coronation is 1,015 years Supposing Nanda's coronation took place in 401 b C, the Mahābhārata war, according to the purāṇas, must have occurred about 1416 b C and the kali must have started in (1416+42 =) 1458 b C (128-131) Then again this would be the beginning of the maghā, i.e., of the 10th saptarṣi century as well Counting from the 1st nakṣatra aśvinī, the 27th nakṣatra, i.e., the last of the cycle, is revatī From the beginning of maghā the 10th saptarṣi century to the end of revatī the 27th, there would be

1,800 years Therefore the 'nava' Saptarṣi Cycle came to an end in  $(1800 - 1458 =) 342$  a C and a new Saptarṣi Cycle began with aśvinī as the 1st century which lasted from 342 to 442 a C According to the purāṇas, therefore, the end of the Andhra dynasty falls within this period

107 *Parīkṣīt—Andhra Interval of 1,893 Years* The birth of Parīkṣīt occurred after 42 years had elapsed of the maghā century which began simultaneously with the kalī From the birth of Parīkṣīt to the coronation of Nanda there is an interval of 1,015 years and from the latter to the end of the Andhras there is the interval of 836 years Therefore from the starting point of the maghā century to the end of the Andhras there is an interval of  $(42 + 1015 + 836 =) 1,893$  years Again from the same starting point to the end of the aśvinī of the new Saptarṣi Cycle there is an interval of 1,900 years (maghā is the 10th century, the last century is the 27th, from maghā to the end of the cycle there are thus 18 centuries = 1,800 years Add 100 years for the 1st century aśvinī of the new cycle This gives 1,900 years) The fixed period of 1,893 years must fall, according to the purāṇas, within this maghā-aśvinī limit of 1,900 years There is no difficulty in accepting this The first is less by  $(1900 - 1893 =) 7$  years than the second If we had accepted the Vāyu figure of 1,050 years instead of the Viṣṇu figure 1,015 as interval between Parīkṣīt and Nanda, our total would have been  $(42 + 1050 + 836 =) 1,928$  years, this would have exceeded the maghā-aśvinī limit of 1,900 years by 28 Accepting Nanda's coronation at 401 b C the end of the Andhras is to be fixed at  $(836 - 401 =) 435$  a C, and since the aśvinī century ended in 442 a C the purāṇas are seen to be quite consistent in assigning aśvinī to the end of the Andhras Further information about Saptarṣi Cycle and puranic chronology will be found in my book 'Purāṇapraveśa'

108 *Concord of four different Counts in Puranic Chronology* Although the saptarṣi count is a century scale and is not of much use in finer calculations it has turned out, in the present circumstances, to be a valuable means of checking the correctness of the puranic stated intervals The intervals provide a corrective for the dynastic total periods which in their turn serve as control for the individual regnal years The concord of puranic dates derived from four different and independent counts, viz, (i) regnal years, (ii) total dynastic reigns, (iii) stated intervals, and (iv) saptarṣi indications, is an index of the internal consistency of the chronological record of the purāṇas and is a strong presumptive evidence of its authenticity It will be noticed that no astronomical calculation is necessary to fix the different puranic chronological systems All time readings can be derived from definite and direct statements

109 *Generation Interval* A few words may be said here regarding regnal periods about which many mistaken notions are common among historians. If in any family the date of a person is known, the date of any of his ancestors or successors whose position in the family tree is known can be guessed with some amount of reliability by means of a factor which I propose to call 'the generation interval'. To determine the generation interval between a father and a son it is necessary to know at what age of the father the son was born. The interval may also be calculated from a fixed age of the father to the same age of the son, e.g., a certain person was 25 years old in 1914 and his son attains the same age in 1938, the generation interval is 24 years. In short, the generation interval is the difference in age between a father and his son. The generation interval thus naturally varies according to the age of the father at which a child is born. When there are several children the generation interval between father and son is greater in the case of the younger children than in that of the elder ones. In royal families it is generally the eldest son that succeeds to the throne so if we could determine the age of the father at which the first male child is born we would get a generation interval that would enable us to fix with some degree of accuracy the dates of kings belonging to any particular dynasty in the absence of chronological records. Late marriage, birth of daughters before the son and death of the eldest son all cause variations in the generation interval for royal families. Then again if the succession to the throne does not pass from the father to the son, the generation interval becomes a false guide in settling chronologies.

110 '*Average Regnal Period*' is a False Guide Since it is rare that a son is born before the father's 18th year, an average of regnal periods below 18 in any series is a certain evidence of repeated interference with direct succession from the father to the son with regard to the kings. Since the age of the father at which a son is born is determined by biological factors, it varies only within certain limits, say between 18 and 40. Regnal years, on the other hand, may show such wide variations e.g. between a single day and 70 years or more that it is worse than useless to fix 'an average regnal period'. One should distinguish between the factor of 'average regnal period' that may be proposed to be taken as a guide to chronological calculations where dates are unknown and 'the average of regnal periods of a particular dynasty where the total period of dynastic reign as well as the numbers of kings have been ascertained'. The 'average regnal period' is a false guide while the 'average of regnal periods' is a true guide.

calculated from known data is an index that may give us valuable information

111 *Determination of Generation Interval* Unfortunately in many instances historians have calculated dates for ancient Indian kings by postulating, each scholar according to his individual fancy, a so-called 'average regnal period' when neither the relations of the successive kings to one another nor their total periods were known. When we know that successive kings stand in the relation of father and son 'the generation interval' may certainly be used for chronological calculation. Here again there is no field for individual choice. I give below a table showing the average ages of the father at which the first, the second and the third son respectively are born in Bengali brāhmana and kāyastha families. The calculations were kindly undertaken on my behalf by Professor P. C. Mahalanobis, I. E. S., Secretary of the Indian Statistical Institute and Editor of the statistical journal 'Samkhyā'. The data were obtained from the records of the Students Welfare Committee of the Calcutta University.

TABLE VII

Sons	Average Age of Father	Probable Error	Number of Data	Standard Deviation
1st son	27.16	$\pm 0.19$	403	5.7
2nd "	30.36	$\pm 0.18$	401	5.47
3rd "	33.79	$\pm 0.22$	359	6.41

112 *Generation Interval in the Purāṇas* The Bengali kāyasthas have kept a count of their generations from the time of Ballāla Sena. At the present time the generation numbers of adult Bengali kāyasthas vary between 20 and 30, the most common generation number among young men of twenty is 28. Ballāla Sena's date is known to be about 1158 A.D. The interval between 1938 A.D. and 1158 A.D. is 780 years. If we divide this by  $(28-1=)$  27, the number of generation intervals for the most common generation number, (the number of generation intervals is one less than the generation number), we get the 'average generation interval' to be 28.9. This tallies with the figures in the table. It will be remembered that the purāṇas believe that 100 kings cover a period of 2,700 years (103), the 'generation interval', according to them, is therefore 27 years. This is remarkably in accordance with the actual state of affairs and the figure must have been found by long continued careful observation.

113 *British Figures* The British figures for the age of the mother at which the first daughter is born are as follows

TABLE VIII

A.D.	Mother's average age at which first daughter was born
1861-1870	28.9
1871-1880	29.0
1881-1890	29.3
1891-1900	29.6
1901-1910	29.9
1910-1912	30.0
1920-1922	29.8

These are British Registrar General's data taken from C. R. Rich—'The measurement of population growth', Journal of the Institute of Actuaries, Vol. LXV, Part No. 3111, 1934, Table 5, p. 52. The corresponding figures for males are not available to me.

114 *Average Generation Interval is  $28 \pm 6$  Years* The 'average generation interval' for historical purposes may thus be taken at about 28 years with a standard deviation of 6. It should be remembered that this figure serves as a reliable guide only in the case of a long series of kings where the succession from father to son has been uninterrupted. It must be admitted that opportunities of applying the 'generation interval factor' profitably must be very rare. The factor, however, serves as a control to check the averages of regnal periods of dynasties.



TABLE IX

Dynasty	Number of Kings	Total Reign in Years	Average of Reigning Periods
Pradyota	5	148	29.6
Śiśunūka	10	332	33.2
Nanda	9	100	11.1
Mauṛya	10	137	13.7
Śunga	10	112	11.2
Kanva	4	45	11.2
Andhra	30	456	15.2

Of the above average figures none is inherently improbable. The averages of reigning periods for the Pradyotas and the Śiśunūkas, when checked by the factor of generation interval, are seen to lie well within the normal limits of  $28 \pm 6$ . The puranic averages of reigning periods give us the very valuable historical information that only in the Pradyota and the Śiśunūka dynasties the succession from father to son was likely to have been uninterrupted. In all the other dynasties repeated disturbances in family succession must have taken place.

117 *Vincent Smith's Doubts are untenable* Vincent Smith writes 'Although the fact that the Śiśunūga dynasty consisted of ten kings may be admitted, neither the duration assigned by the Purāṇas to the dynasty as a whole, nor that allotted to certain reigns, can be accepted. Experience proves that in a long series an average of twenty-five years to a generation is rarely attained, and that this average is still more rarely exceeded in a series of reigns as distinguished from generations' (Ehṛ p. 47). Wherever there is an uninterrupted succession from father to son the average reigning period, as I have already indicated, is likely to rise above 25 and it would not be wrong to say even above 30 years in a short series like that of the Śiśunūkas. Vincent Smith also doubts the possibility of the successive high figures 42 and 43 for the regnal years of Nandivardhana and Mahānandi (Ehṛ p. 41). There is, however, nothing inherently improbable in this. Let us suppose that Nandivardhana ascended the throne in his 23rd year and that Mahānandi, his son, was born at his 40th year. He may be supposed to have died at 65 years. This gives him a regnal period of 42 years. At the time of Mahānandi's death his son would be 25 years old, there is nothing to suppose that he could not have attained the age of 68 which would give him a 43 years' reign. Vincent Smith is utterly wrong in his suppositions regarding both dynastic and individual reigning periods as the previous discussions should prove.

118 *Discrepancies* We find that the purāṇa accounts, as regards either recorded regnal years or dynastic total periods, may safely be relied upon. The chronology also is found to be strongly supported by various internal evidence. The discrepancies that have been noticed are just of the type that one would expect in authentic accounts recorded by different persons and transmitted in writing on frail material by scribes from generation to generation. When it is remembered that information more than 2,500 years old has been preserved in this manner one wonders that there have not been discrepancies of a more serious nature. The causes that prevented this mischief and served to preserve the purāṇas from total extinction lie in the religious attitude of the Indian public towards them, an attitude deliberately fostered by the purāṇakāras. It is said by the purāṇas that anybody who makes a copy of a purāṇa and presents it to a learned brāhmana attains heaven; any one who hears recites or preserves the dynastic lists is sure to be blessed with children, riches and so on. (Vip-b IV 3 Vap-a 99 462-463 Mtp a 53.) I have already said that the purāṇas have been considered to be as inviolable as the Vedas. Vans Kennedy wrote in 1840 'It is, at least, certain that the manuscripts of the Purāṇas which are, at this day, spread over India, from Cashmere to the extremity of the southern peninsula, and from Jagannatha to Dwaraka, contain precisely the same works and it is, therefore, most probable that the Purāṇas have always been preserved in precisely the same state as that in which they were first committed to writing' (Vip w Appendix, p 293 n).

119 *Successive Redactors of the Purāṇas* From all this it is not to be supposed that the purāṇas were written down in some remote ancient time in their present form and have remained in that state ever since. The original accounts of the different purāṇas were regularly supplemented with fresh historical materials from age to age and were brought up to date by successive purāṇakāras. The names of 24 such successive editors of the Viṣṇupurāṇa are to be found in that work in Bk VI Chap 8 42. The names of the redactors of the Vāyu are mentioned in Vāyu 103 58, they are 30 in number. The prophetic form of writing is a convention that serves to perpetuate the memory of some past illustrious purāṇakāra. It is not a deliberate device to dupe the credulous laity. We have parallel instances at the present time also. Gray's Anatomy still goes by that name although successive editors have changed the original beyond recognition. One may similarly hope that Wells's history will be called by that name 500 years hence although fresh materials might continue to be added from time to time to keep it up to date. In this connection it is interesting to note that an unknown redactor, following the old tradition has sought to bring the Bhavishyapurāṇa up to date by inserting

historical accounts that come down to the time of Queen Victoria. A historical record in the purāṇas is not to be necessarily disbelieved simply because it happened to have been added to in later times.

## 8 THE PURANIC ERA

120 *Nanda's Coronation Date as Point of Reference* I shall now take up the question whether the purāṇakāras have mentioned any era with reference to which the regnal years, the total periods and the intervals recorded by them may be definitely located. It must be admitted at once that they have not specified by name any era of this sort, but that they actually did use one is to be inferred from certain passages in the purāṇas. When anybody writes that Alexander died 323 years before the birth of Christ and the great European War took place 1,914 years after Christ was born, one is justified in concluding that the birth of Christ coincided with the epoch of an era started in commemoration of the event. Now compare with this the ślokas 415, 416 and 417 of chapter 99 of the Vāyu. These ślokas may be translated as follows: 'From the coronation of Mahādeva (Mahāpadma Nanda) to the birth of Parīkṣit an interval of 1,050 years is to be recognized. The measure of an interval that comes after Mahāpadma has also been stated, this interval is known to be one of 836 years, it is said that this period denotes the end of the Andhras. The time interval has been counted by future learned ṛṣis versed in the purāṇas.'

Similarly the Matsya states 'From the coronation of Mahāpadma to the birth of Parīkṣit 1,050 years have been known to have elapsed. Till Paulomā or till the Andhras after Mahāpadma again there is an interval of 836 years. These (two) intervals intervene between Parīkṣit and the end of the Andhras. They have been counted by learned ṛṣis versed in the purāṇas in later times' (Mtp-a, 273, 36-38). The Viṣṇupurāṇa states 'From the birth of Parīkṣit to the coronation of Nanda [an interval is to be taken into account], this [interval] is to be recognized as [one of] fifteen [years] in addition to one thousand years' (Vip-b IV 24, 32, Vip-w p 230). The Viṣṇupurāṇa mentions the interval between Nanda and Parīkṣit only and puts it down at 1,015 years instead of 1,050 years as in the Vāyu and in the Matsya. [For transiteration of the Vap, Mtp and Vip ślokas, referred to in this paragraph, see ap]. These statements justify the assumption that the later purāṇakāras used Nanda's coronation as the central reference point of their time records, i.e., they used the date of Mahāpadma Nanda's coronation as the epoch of an era for the purposes of chronology. We may call this era the Nanda era.

121 *The Nanda Era* The Nanda era seems to have been in continuous use from the time of Nanda till the end of the Andhras at least. Nanda was a very powerful monarch who, as the purāṇas state, annihilated all independent kṣatriya kings and brought the whole country under his sway. If the purāṇas are to be believed, he was a greater emperor than even Yudhiṣṭhira. It is perfectly natural that Nanda should have started an era of his own, much lesser kings have done the same. This consideration, when taken in conjunction with the puranic statements mentioned above, makes it almost certain that Nanda did start an era. Nanda's era must have acquired wide currency as he ruled over an extensive empire.

122 *Fate of the Nanda Era* One is naturally curious to know what happened to this era. No absolutely certain information can be given on this point. No inscription or coin or any literary reference that mentions this era has yet been discovered, this is rather strange, as the fact that the purāṇakāras continued to count time in terms of this era for 800 years at least till as late as the end of the Andhras proves that the era must have been more widely prevalent and better known than either the Vikrama Samvat or the Śakābda. My contention is that the Nanda era has all along been in continuous use since the time of Nanda under a modified form and a different name and it is still being used at the present time. The Kalh era that the Indian almanacs have been recording from year to year from a very remote past, and that has been used as a point of reference by all astronomers, is really a modified Nanda era. This supposition, as I shall presently show, gives a date for Nanda's coronation that fits in extremely well with the whole scheme of puranic chronology, taking this as the starting point of our calculations we can fix the dates of all the puranic dynasties and of all individual kings from the recorded total and regnal periods as has been done in Table IV. The dates thus obtained for Candragupta, Aśoka and others will be seen to be in perfect accord with those obtained from other sources. In fact these puranic dates serve to clear up many obscure points in ancient Indian history. They do not clash with any definite finding from any other reliable source. The supposition may therefore be considered to be of the nature of a theory in science. A theory is justifiable and is acceptable if it offers a satisfactory and adequate explanation of different facts.

123 *Social Order in the Kalh Yuga* In order to understand how the Nanda era was transformed into the Kalh era of the present time we have to turn to the purāṇas again. I have already pointed out that the Kalpa Cycle of 5,000 years was divided into four unequal divisions in the ratio of 4 3 2 1. This gave a kalh of 500 years. The motive behind this division was based on socio-religious conceptions.

XXXIV Trans  
formation of  
Nanda Era

of the purāṇakāras 'Sūryasiddhānta' says that the division of a kalpa into kṛta, etc is for the purpose of indicating 'dharma-pāda', i.e., the socio religious state of the people (1 16) During the kṛta period the dharma of the society is believed to be of the order of 'four-quarters', i.e., it is at its best, in tretā it is three quarters, in dvāpara it is two quarters and in kali the dharma is merely one quarter. According to the purāṇakāras there was no conception of sin in the society in the early kṛta yuga, social order became fixed in tretā when kings laid down laws for the conduct of people, the idea of sin developed at this stage. The sinful propensities of men went on increasing progressively till in kali only one quarter dharma was left. After the end of kali the social order was supposed to begin anew from the kṛta stage (Vap-a 57, 58, 59) The purāṇakāras believed in a regular cycle of social and moral development.

124 *Kalki and the new Kṛta Age* The Vāyu says that in the kali age, the brāhmanas, kṣatriyas and vaiśyas gradually get extinct and most of the kings happen to be of the śūdra caste and they become patrons of the 'pāsanda faith'. It is commonly believed that the kali age is still going on and that when this age ends Kalki, an incarnation of Viṣṇu, will be born and will restore the social and religious order to its pristine glory ushering in a new kṛta age. Curiously enough the Kalkipurāṇa describes the exploits of Kalki not in the prophetic form but as events of the past. It says that Kalki was born long ago, that he married the daughter of king Brhadratha, took king Viśākhayūpa as his ally and killed king Suddhodana and all mlecchas, yavanas and other heretics and restored dharma on this earth (Klp 1 4 30, 2 1 25, 2 3 76, 2 7 28)

125 *Contemporaries of Kalki* The tradition, on which the Kalkipurāṇa is based, gives us three important items of information, viz., (i) Kalki lived in the past, (ii) he was a contemporary of Viśākhayūpa, Brhadratha and Suddhodana, and (iii) he ushered in the kṛta yuga. I have already pointed out that the puranic kali yuga began in 1458 b C (on the assumption that Nanda's coronation was in 401 b C), and lasted for 500 years. The kali thus ended in 958 b C when a new kṛta began with a transition period of 2,000 months, i.e., of about 167 years after which the kṛta yuga proper was established. This would give us (958-167 =) 791 b C as the date of the setting in of kṛta yuga proper. A reference to Table IV will show that the Pradyota king Viśākhayūpa's reign lasted from 834 b C to 784 b C. The starting point of the kṛta yuga proper falls within this period. This is a remarkable agreement. From puranic evidence it can be further proved that Suddhodana or Kruddhodana of the Ikṣvāku dynasty and Brhadratha of the Puru dynasty were both contemporaries of Viśākhayūpa of the Pradyota dynasty (Ppv Chap 19). Thus the Kalki tradition is fully supported by puranic chronology, but the peculiar fact emerges that in

current Hindu tradition the age of Kalki has been pushed forward to a remote future, it remains to be explained how this could happen

126 *Extension of the old Kali Yuga* According to the old puranic tradition the second *krta* which began after the end of *kali* in 958 b C must have ended in  $(2000-958 =) 1042$  a C, when the second *tretā* began, this *tretā* would last till  $(1042+1500 =) 2542$  a C. So if we are to calculate on the basis of the old puranic dharma scale, we should admit that the *tretā* age is still continuing. A reference to the Indian calendar will, however, show that we are living in the *kali* age. The calendar records further that this *kali* age started in 3101 b C and will continue for an incredibly long, long time yet. It is obvious that the puranic *kali* of 500 years has suffered an increase and has been extended both backwards and forwards. We find an interesting puranic reference to this modification of the *kali* period. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* writes

‘They (the *saptarṣis*) were in *maghā*, O the best of *biāhmanas*, at the time of *Parīkṣit*, and it was then that the *kali* of 1,200 (*divya*) years began, when the incarnation, that was the part of Lord *Viṣṇu* himself, and that was born of the race of *Vasudeva*, left for heaven then came *kali*. So long as he (*Kṛṣṇa*) continued to tread on this earth with his lotus feet the *kali* did not succeed in making any impression on this world. When the part of the Eternal *Viṣṇu* returned to heaven, *Yudhiṣṭhira*, the son of *dharma*, left the kingdom with his younger brothers, and seeing untoward portents at the passing away of *Kṛṣṇa* installed *Parīkṣit* on the throne. When the great *ṛṣis* (*saptarṣis*) go over to the *pūrvāśādhā* then from *Nanda* onwards this *kali* will suffer an increase. When *Kṛṣṇa* left for heaven then and on that very day started the *kali* age the count of which, as you hear from me, will be 360,000 human years, when 1,200 *divya* years will have elapsed then *krta* will start again’ (*Vip-b IV 24 34-42*)

126 (1) *Divya Years and Kali Yuga* 1,200 *divya* years are equivalent to  $(1200 \times 360 =) 432,000$  human years. This is conceived to be the total period of the *kali* referred to in this quotation and mentioned in Indian almanacs, of this period, one-tenth, i.e., 36,000 years, from the transition period at the beginning and the same number of years from the transition period at the end, the *kali yuga* proper has 360,000 years as stated in the text. We thus get  $(36000+360000+36000 =) 432,000$  years for the complete *kali*. This big figure is really derived in a simple manner from an originally conceived *yuga* of 1,000 human years.

127 *Transition Periods* For the purpose of indicating the transition periods of any yuga it is first converted into months. The transition periods have as many months each as the years of the complete yuga. Counted in years or in months each transition period is one-tenth the yuga proper. 1,000 years make 12,000 months for the complete yuga, of this, 1,200 months form the transition period at the beginning, 12,000 months the middle, the yuga proper, and 1,200 months the end. These figures are now multiplied each by 360, the factor for the divya scale, for the purpose of getting a magnified yuga. Divya measure is to human measure as a 'sāvana' year is to a day, i.e., as 360 is to 1. Starting from a yuga of 1,000 years the purāṇakāras thus got an extended kali of  $(432000 + 4320000 + 432000 =) 5,184,000$  months or 432,000 years. (For fuller details of the construction of the puranic yuga cycles see my book *Purāṇapraveśa*.) In the enumeration of the kali count in the text quoted from *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, Nanda's name seems at first quite out of place. It has really been introduced just to indicate that the old kali of 500 years suffered an increase, and was replaced by the big kali with Nanda's time as the fixed point of reference and that Nanda's date has an important bearing in the determination of the epoch of the new kali yuga.

128 *The old Kali and the 28th Pitr Yuga* In order to understand the part played by the date of Nanda's coronation in the fixing of the beginning of this kali we shall have to go back on the old kali count that formed a part of the Kalpa Cycle of 5,000 years. Before the introduction of the saptarsi century scale the purāṇakāras, for the purpose of historical reference, divided the 5,000 years of the kalpa into 30 yugas, each comprising 2,000 months. This yuga may conveniently be called the 'pitr yuga' because it was used to locate the times of the 'pitrs' or ancestors, i.e., people who were long dead (Ppv pp 43-). The first 12 pitr yugas, covering 2,000 years, constituted the kṛta, from the 13th to the 21st pitr yuga the period of 1,500 years was the tretā, from the 22nd to the end of the 27th was the dvāpara with a duration of 1,000 years, and from the 28th to the end of the 30th was the kali of 500 years. This old kali began in the 28th yuga, and Kṛṣṇa also was born in the same yuga (Vap-a 98 97, Vip-b V 23 25 Skp Viṣṇukhanda 3 13). So we find that in the old scale 27 yugas had elapsed before kali commenced. According to the puranic conception kali yuga is characterized by loss of prestige of the brāhmanas and by increased sinfulness of the people, the śūdras become king at this period.

129 *Falsification of Puranic Conception in Nanda's Times* Now when Nanda became the undisputed monarch the purāṇakāras found that although the age was second kṛta according to the old dharma scale, and although according to tradition

there should have been present 'four quarters dharma' among the people yet, as a matter of fact, a śūdra had come to the throne (Nanda was the son of a śūdra woman), and this śūdra had exterminated all the ksatriya kings belonging to ancient dynasties, Buddhism and Jainism which were both 'pāśanda faith' were rampant. The puranic conception was thus entirely falsified, the signs of the times all pointed to the kali age. The purāṇakāras therefore, extended the period of kali. Since it was known that before kali set in 27 yugas had elapsed and since they were counting yugas in terms of the Saptarsi Cycle at the time, they added 27 saptarsi yugas to Nanda's date and pushed back the epoch of the Nanda era by 2,700 years, the extended Nanda era constituted the new kali yuga, this placed Nanda at the end of the 27th yuga and the beginning of the 28th which corresponded to the beginning of the kali in the old scale. The old tradition was thus sought to be maintained and Nanda's time was turned into kali. They called this new era Kalyabda or the Kali era, and it has been known by that name ever since.

130 *Nanda is described as an Incarnation of Kali* Nanda has been called 'Kāḥkāmśajah' by the Matsya (272-18) and 'Kālasambṛtaḥ' by Vāyu (99-326). Both these epithets are extremely significant. The first means 'born of a part of kali', i.e., an incarnation of kali (Kṛṣṇa has been similarly called 'viśnorāmsaja', i.e., an incarnation of Viṣṇu Vp-b IV 24-35). 'Kālasambṛtaḥ' means 'the chosen of the Time'. The kali age 'chose' Nanda for the purpose of fixing its epoch, and lent its own name to the Nanda era. Another possible meaning of 'kālasambṛtaḥ' is 'hidden or covered by time'. Nanda's coronation date may be said to be hidden by the Kali era. In later times this era was also called the Yudhiṣṭhira era since Yudhiṣṭhira was known to have been the first king of the old kali age that got included within the new kali. Still later, instead of saying that the 28th yuga was the kali yuga it was asserted that the present kali of 432,000 years is the 28th kali of an immensely big cycle. This saved contradictions that would have been otherwise inevitable as a result of the confusion between the 28th pitṛ yuga of the old scale and the 28th yuga of the Kali era, counted according to the newer saptarsi century scale.

131 *Fixing Nanda's Coronation at 401 b C* In order to fix the date of Nanda's coronation we have thus to find out the epoch of the present Kali era and deduct from it 2,700 years. The Kali epoch, according to the Indian calendar, is 3101 b C. Therefore the date of Nanda's coronation is  $(3101 - 2700) = 401$  b C. I have already said that this date fits in extremely well with other known dates and is not contradicted by any definite and reliable finding from any other source. It clears up many obscure points in ancient Indian history.



## 9 CORRELATION OF DATA

132 *Inscriptional Dates for Gautamīputra and Pulumāvi*  
106 A D - 150 A D

XXXVI Corre  
lation of Data  
Gautamīputra and  
Pulumāvi

Having obtained dates from the purāṇas for the Andhra kings it will now be possible to correlate the puranic data with the inscription and coin data of the Andhras. The only certain dates on the inscriptional side are those for the two successive kings Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi and his son Vāsisthīputra Śrī Pulumāvi. They may be placed between 106 A D and 150 A D (19 6a). The dates ascribed to Simuka and the third king Śātakarṇi by modern scholars rest on an extremely flimsy basis as I have already shown (80-82). The dates 106 A D and 150 A D, therefore, should form the basis for identification.

133 *Puranic Dates for the sixth and the seventh Kings*  
74 a C - 148 a C

A reference to the puranic dates in Table IV will at once show that kings No 6 and No 7 reigned from 74 a C to 148 a C. Their respective puranic names are Śātakarṇi or Śrī Śātakarṇi and Lambodara. The sixth king Śrī Śātakarṇi can therefore be identified with almost complete certainty with Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi of the inscriptions, the Gautamīputra that was the contemporary of Usavadāta of the inscriptions and whose mother was Balaśrī and whose son was Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi. King No 7, Lambodara, of the purāṇas is thus to be identified with Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi who was presumably a contemporary of Ptolemy and who is said to have been defeated twice by Rudradāman of the Junagadh Gurnar inscription. In establishing these two identities it is to be noted that the gotra name Gautamīputra of king No 6 has not been mentioned by the purāṇas nor the name Pulumāvi of king No 7. We know from inscriptions that Yajñasrī was also a Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, in his case too, the purāṇas do not record the gotra name. A reference to my previous discussion of the names of Andhra kings (30-37, 63, 75, 89) will show that this omission is no justification for rejecting the identification. On the other hand, if we admit the possibility that Śātakarṇi might have been a personal name of some particular Andhra king, our choice will certainly fall on king No 6 who has been uniformly called Śātakarṇi by all the purāṇas. In line 9 of the Balaśrī inscription Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi has been called simply Śrī Śātakarṇi (150, 151). King No 3, who is also called Śātakarṇi by the Viṣṇu, has a variant in Śrīmallakarṇi, in the Matsya. The arguments about names need not detain us any further, for their reliability as a basis for identification, even when there is concord in regard to two or more successive names, is, as I have shown, quite small. The only relevant fact that we should consider in proposing an identity, when there are two different

names, is whether the discrepancy between them is of such an order as to preclude it

133 (1) *Identities of Śrī Śātakarṇi with Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi and of Lambodara with Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi*  
The names Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi of the inscription and Śrī Śātakarṇi of the purāṇas are certainly not of this type, they are complementary to each other. The name Lambodara of the 7th king is obviously a sobriquet. There is nothing against the supposition that his personal name was Pulumāvi. It is true that this will add another Pulomā to the four already existing in the puranic list. The frequency of occurrence of this name among the Andhras is in favour of, rather than against, the supposition that Lambodara was Pulumāvi. The dates for Lambodara on the one hand and for Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi on the other do not leave any doubt about the identity of the two. The regnal periods of Lambodara (18 years) and Pulumāvi (latest regnal year = 24) do not tally, the same type of discrepancy between the puranic and inscriptional regnal years is also to be seen in the case of Yajñaśrī. Such differences can be satisfactorily explained, as I have already shown, by the supposition that a period of provincial rule preceded the accession to the throne (40). In the case of Pulumāvi there is some definite evidence in support of this argument. (151)

134. *Date of Yajñaśrī from Chinese Records 408 A.D.*

XXXVII  
Yajñaśrī  
Inscriptions and coins do not offer any other certain date that might enable us to establish other points of contact between the puranic and the inscriptional series. Fortunately there are literar-

in his Viṣṇupurāṇa Both Yue-ai and Yue-gnai (Yajñaśrī), therefore, belong to the same place The date A D 428 and the name Yue-ai, that means 'Moon-loved' according to V Smith, agree with the date and name of the 29th Andhra king, Candrasīri, who, according to the purāṇas, reigned from 418 a C to 428 a C The two may therefore be considered to be the same person

137 *Story of Vikramāditya* An Indian literary record will help us to test the puranic date of Śiśuka the first Andhra king There is a well known Sanskrit work named 'Dvātrīṃśat Puttalikā' the authorship of which is popularly ascribed to Kālidāsa Neither the date of this work nor any correct information of its authorship is relevant to my purpose I shall only consider a certain tradition recorded in this work The story, in short, is as follows

In the town of Ujjayinī there ruled a rājā named Bhartrhari His younger brother was called Vikramāditya Owing to the suspected infidelity of his beloved wife Bhartrhari got disgusted with mundane affairs and, abdicating the throne in favour of his younger brother, left the kingdom in order to live the life of an ascetic Vikramāditya who succeeded to the throne was a very learned prince himself and a great patron of learning He was versed in all the fine arts of his time

138 *Vikramāditya's Death at the Hand of Śālvāhana* Vikramāditya was a daring and an ambitious prince After he had succeeded his brother he went out on a military expedition, made extensive conquests and returned home with immense wealth (16th anecdote) He built himself a throne the steps of which were made of 32 statuettes Vikramāditya's statuette throne enjoyed a reputation that was only rivalled in later times by the peacock throne of the Mughals Vikramāditya styled himself 'rājādhirāja, paramēśvara, lord of the earth up to the seas' (32nd anecdote) After many years of Vikramāditya's reign had passed by it so happened that in a town called Pratiṣṭhānagara a girl, who was only two years and a half old, gave birth to a son called Śālvāhana The father of the boy was Śeṣa the king of the Nāgas At the birth of the boy evil portents made their appearance in Ujjayinī There were earthquakes, rising of comets and other unusual phenomena The royal astrologers were consulted They said the disturbances portended danger to the king Vikramāditya remembered that as a reward for his religious austerities he had once earned a boon that he could only be killed by a person born of a girl two years and a half old Vikrama thought that as this was an impossibility he was safe from everybody The astrologers said that the ways of natural creation were 'unthinkable' so it would be wise to make enquiries Vetāla, a courtier of Vikramāditya, was deputed for this purpose He searched many countries for

such a prodigy and ultimately came to Pratiṣṭhānagara, and saw in the house of a potter an infant boy (mānavakam) and a golden gul (kānchari kanyākam) playing together. On being asked the gul informed him that the boy was her son, the gul pointed out a brāhmana who, she said, was her father. The brāhmana informed Vetāla that the boy, who was named Śālvāhana, was born as a result of his daughter's association with Śeṣa the king of the Nāgas. Vetāla returned to Ujjayini and told Vikramāditya of the fact. On hearing this Vikramāditya started for Pratiṣṭhānagara with a sword, and when he attempted to kill Śālvāhana the latter struck back with a rod with such force that Vikramāditya was hurled back to Ujjayini where he died of his injuries. (Valuśruta anecdote.)

139 *Vikramāditya's Defeat at the Hand of Śālvāhana* There is a different version of the above story in the 24th anecdote which states that Vikramāditya sent an order by a letter to Śālvāhana asking him to attend his court, but Śālvāhana refused. Thereupon Vikramāditya started with an immense army to punish him. Śālvāhana, who was then living in a potter's house, created fighting units consisting of elephants, cavalry, chariots and infantry out of potter's earth, gave them life by recanting mantras, and went to meet Vikramāditya. Śālvāhana was at first defeated but he soon got a reinforcement from the king of the Nāgas who sent a huge army of Nāgas to help him. Vikramāditya's battalions were completely routed, he went back to Ujjayini where he lived for nine years more in penance doing homage to Vāsuki (the lord of the serpents or Nāgas) before he died. He did not raise another army to attack Śālvāhana again because of a promise he had made to an agent of the latter. The first version has been inserted in the chapter named 'valuśrutopākhyāna' which means 'oft-heard story'.

140 *Śiśuka the conqueror of Vikramāditya* It is quite easy to get at the truth that has been preserved in the interesting traditional accounts of the Dvātimśat Puttalikā. The potter's earth, out of which armies could be raised, is the State. It is quite common in Sanskrit literature to denote 'kingdom' by the term 'earth' (cf. kṣitipati = lord of the earth). The golden gul represents the deity of the State that was full of riches. She is only two years and a half old in the story showing that the State was a newly acquired one. She was born of a brāhmana the Kanva king, whom the first Śālvāhana displaced, was a brāhmana. The new king was born as a result of an association of the State with the Nāgas who also helped the king in overthrowing Vikramāditya. The most interesting portion of the whole account is the fact that Śālvāhana is represented as an infant, as a 'mānavaka', an expression that is an exact equivalent of the name of the first Śālvāhana Andhra king 'Śiśuka'. 'Śiśuka' means a little infant. No doubt is left as to which Śālvāhana is referred to in the story, especially when we

remember that this 'mānavaka' lived in Pratisthānagara which is certainly identical with Pratisthana or Paithan, an important seat of the Andhras

141 *Contemporaneity of the first Andhra King and Vikramāditya* Śisuka the first Śālivāhana Andhra king may, therefore be safely regarded as a contemporary of the famous Vikramāditya of Ujjayini. Vikramāditya is certainly not an imaginary figure as many have supposed. In Indian tradition the first Śālivāhana king has often been confused with the sixth Śālivāhana king, as I shall show later on, but the story in the *Dvātrimsat Puttalikā* shows no such admixture. The account refers to the first Śālivāhana king solely. An effort may now be made to construct a historical account of the first Śālivāhana king Śisuka from traditional materials referred to here. I see no valid reason for disbelieving this tradition.

142 *Vikram Samvat 57 B C* It is well known that Vikramāditya of Ujjayini was the founder of the Samvat era the epoch of which is 57 B C. At this period, according to the purāṇas, the Kanvas were the paramount power in India, and Bhūnumitra, the second Kanva king, was on the imperial throne. (See Table IV.) It seems that Bhartihari, the elder brother of Vikramāditya, was a vassal of the Kanvas as, according to tradition, he was merely a 'rājā'. Vikramāditya who succeeded him was an ambitious person. He broke away from the suzerainty of the Kanvas, conquered surrounding territories and proclaimed himself an independent 'rājādhirāja'. According to other traditions he turned out the Śakas and waged an unrelenting campaign against them, and earned for himself the sobriquet 'Śakāni' or the 'enemy of the Śakas'. He started an era apparently in commemoration of his independence. As Vikrama was a great patron of learning he attracted many learned men to his court among whom were astronomers. It was through the help of the astronomers of Vikrama's court that the Samvat era obtained wide currency. The Kanvas were apparently too weak to interrupt the victorious career of such a daring person as Vikramāditya and he continued to reign unmolested by them.

143 *Andhras and the Nāgas* About 21 b C., taking advantage of the weakness of the last Kanva Suśarman, another powerful vassal, who was ruling in the provinces round about Paithan, Śisuka by name, usurped the throne. Śisuka the Andhra, it appears from the tradition, belonged to the Nāga tribe and he was helped in his military activities by the Nāgas. In this connection Rapson's remarks are interesting. Referring to the Andhra rulers Cuṭukadānanda and Mudānanda, Rapson says 'If Amgīya-kula-vadhana and Mudānanda are correctly explained as referring to the Angas and Mundas of Eastern India, it must be supposed that the Andhras were associated with other Dravidian peoples in the conquest of the West'

(Cca p 223 n) The word Nāga is also associated with some of the Andhra princes, e.g., Khamda-Nāga-Sātaka, Śiva-Khamda-Nāga-Śrī (Cca p 131) The Nāga symbol is to be found in some coins associated with the Andhras (Cca p 53) The elephant symbol, so common in Andhra coins, is very likely a Nāga symbol as one of the meanings of the word Nāga is elephant In the Balaśrī inscription the comparison of Gautamīputra to both a serpent and an elephant is significant (36)

144 *Śiśuka's Accession in 21 b C* When Śiśuka usurped the imperial throne in 21 b C Vikramāditya naturally got restive and his ambition blazed up He thought he could easily oust the śūdra usurper who was not yet firmly settled on the throne and become the monarch himself He took two years and a half in preparation, and led an expedition against Śiśuka who was then in Parthian The enemy, however, proved too strong for him Unexpected hordes of Nāgas came to the help of Śiśuka, and Vikramāditya's army was totally routed He became a tributary to Śiśuka and had to pay him homages Vikramāditya is likely to have been thus vanquished about  $(21 - 2\frac{1}{2} =) 18$  b C He died 9 years later, about 9 b C, according to tradition Vikramāditya must have succeeded his brother, who was himself young at the time of abdication, at a very early age Supposing he was 24 years old when he proclaimed himself an independent king and started the Samvat era, he is likely to have been born about  $(24 \text{ years} + 57 \text{ B C, the epoch of Vikrama era} =) 81 \text{ B C}$  He would thus have been  $(81 - 9 =) 72$  years old at the time of his death There is thus nothing improbable in the traditional account that would go against the supposition that Śiśuka and Vikramāditya were contemporaries On the other hand, the coincidence of dates is almost a certain proof of the contemporaneity of these two kings The province of Mālava annexed by Śiśuka seems to have been lost to the Andhras some time afterwards It was reconquered by Gautamīputra Gautamīputra, as will be seen later (168), appointed Caṣṭana to its governorship

145 *External support for the Puranic dates of the Andhras*

XL Four point Contact There is thus a four-point contact, between the puranic data for the series of 30 Andhra kings on the one hand and inscriptional and literary evidence on the other, showing simultaneous concord of names and dates at each point Table X shows the agreement of dates and names at a glance

TABLE X FOUR-POINT CONTACT

PURĀṆAS			OTHER SOURCES	
No	Name of King	Dates	Dates	Names and Reference
1	Sisuka	21 b C 2 a C	Later than 57 B C by 'many years of Vikrama's reign'	'Mānavaka' or Infant Śālināhana (Dvā- triṃśat Puttalikā)
6	Śrī Śātakaṛṇi	74 a C 130 a C	106 A D 130 A D	Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakaṛṇi (Inscrip- tion Cea p 222)
27	Yajñaśrī	403 a C 412 a C	408 A D	Yue gnaī (Chinese annals Vip w IV pp 201-205)
29	Candraśrī	418 a C 428 a C	428 A D	Yuo ai (Moon loved) (Chinese record Elu p 313)

be no doubt that the political conditions which admitted of the growth of a strong power in this part of India were due to the decline and fall of the Andhra empire, but the foundation of an era must be held to denote the successful establishment of the new power rather than its first beginnings or the downfall of the Andhras' (p. clxi) 'It must therefore remain for the present doubtful whether the Traikūṭaka kings founded an era of their own, or whether they continued to use a chronological system established by their predecessors' (p. clxi) It is to be noticed that Rapson did not take into account the possibility of the Ābhīras or the early Traikūṭakas' acting as satraps of the paramount Andhra power

148 *Traikūṭaka date supports Puranic account* It is not at all necessary to assume the fall of the Andhras in any province at any period merely because of the existence of a kṣatrapa or of a mahāksatrapa in that locality at the time Provincial governorships frequently changed hands without in any way affecting the paramount power The presence of the title 'mahārājā' or something similar is of course a strong presumptive evidence of the independence of the person using the title It is quite likely that the Ābhīras and Traikūṭakas used an independent era, that they also used the title 'rājā' is also evident, but neither Īśvardatta (Cca pp. 124, 125) nor Īśvarsena the Ābhīra king (Is. 1137), both of whom dated their records in regnal years, has the honorific 'śrī' attached to their names They have not been called mahārājās anywhere On the other hand, the inscription and the coins of the Traikūṭaka kings show that Indradatta, his son Dahrasena and Dahrasena's son Vyāghrasena all three bore the title 'mahārājā' and the last two who were living at the time of the records have in addition the honorific 'śrī' attached to their names These three kings were certainly independent The date Traikūṭaka era 207 = A D 456, recorded by the second king, would seem to imply that the first ruled about 430 A D This date fits in extremely well with the date of the fall of the Andhra empire The available dates for the Traikūṭaka kings thus give an additional support to the puranic account I shall have to say something more about the Ābhīra kings later on (183)

149 *No dark period following the Andhras* The fact that the Andhra empire lasted from 21 b C to 435 a C is a proof of the non-existence of the dark period in Indian history The 'dark period' is certainly an artifact There is a continuous historical account, although not very rich in details, available from the time of the Andhras to the rise of the Guptas According to the purāṇas the Guptas did not enjoy so extensive an empire as the Andhras did No rival dynasties reigning simultaneously with the Andhras have been mentioned, while it is specifically said that the Guptas ruled over the country along the Ganges, Prayāga, Sāketa and Magadha only, and that the Maṇḍhānya



kings, the Devarakṣita kings, the Guha kings and the Kanaka kings reigned over different territories (the names of which have been mentioned) contemporaneously with the Guptas (Vap-a 99 383-387) It appears from the available Gupta accounts that they did not depend so much on provincial governors for controlling their territories as the Andhras did. The direct rule of the Guptas would account for the extensive minting of coins by them, many of which still survive. If the Gupta chronology as accepted today be correct, it must be admitted that the later Andhras and the early Guptas were contemporaries. The Andhra empire on this supposition began to break up from about the time the Andhrabhrtyas came to the throne. The puranic evidence, however, is that the Guptas rose to power after 435 a C. In view of the trustworthiness of the puranic statements, so amply demonstrated in the case of the Andhras, the chronology of the Guptas requires a careful re-examination before it is taken to be final.

150 *An important document* Before I make an attempt

XLII Balaśrī to locate, in the puranic list, the positions of  
Inscription other Andhra kings mentioned in inscriptions,  
some of the palæographic records will have to  
be considered to determine the limits of deductions that can be  
drawn from them. The inscription of queen Gautamī Balaśrī  
is perhaps the most important document for the elucidation of  
Andhra history. Balaśrī's inscription is No. 1123 in the Lūder-  
List. I quote below the translation of this inscription from the  
report of Bhagvanlal Indrajī in the Bombay Gazetteer (1883  
Vol. XVI, pp. 550- Inscription 2). This inscription 'is in  
eleven long lines of large and distinct letters. Except two holes  
for a hold-fast made in the last two lines, and a crack in the  
rock which runs from top to bottom, the inscription is well  
preserved'. It has not been possible in Bhagvanlal Indrajī's  
translation to maintain the sequence of the original lines.  
Portions of lines 9 and 10 have been incorporated in line 1 in the  
translation. The translation is not literal in all places either.  
I have attempted to indicate roughly the numbers of the original  
lines of the inscription in the translation for ease of reference.

*Nasik, Pandu-Lena Caves, Inscription 2 Translation*  
*by Bhagvanlal Indrajī (For transliteration of the*  
*inscription, see ap)*

- 1 On the thirteenth (13) day of the second (2) fortnight  
of the summer months in the nineteenth (19) year  
of the illustrious King Pulumayī, son of Vāsithī  
(Sk Vāsishthī),
- 9, 10 a dwelling-cave, a meritorious gift, in its great  
perfection equal to the best of celestial chariots, was  
caused to be made on the summit of Trraśmī hill  
(a summit) like the top of  
mountain

by the Great Queen Gautamī Balaśrī, a lover of truth, charity, forbearance, and respect for life, eagerly engaged in penance, self-control, mortification, and fasts, fully bearing out the title 'Wife of the Royal Sage', mother of the illustrious Sātakarṇi

- 1 Gautamīputra (son of Gautamī), King of Kings, equal in greatness to the Himavat, Meru,
- 2 and Mandara mountains, King of Asika, Susaka, Mulaka (or Mundaka), Surath (Sk Surāshtra), Kukura (Sk Kukkura), Aparāta (Sk Aparānta), Anupa (Sk Anūpa), Vidabha (Sk Vīdarbha), Ākara and Avanti, lord of the Vījha (Sk Vīndhya), Rīkhavat (Sk Rīkshavat), Pārīchāta (Sk Pārīyātra), Sahya, Kāṇhagiri (Sk Kṛṣṇagiri), Mancha, Sīrtana (Sk Sīrsthāna), Malaya, Mahinda (Sk Mahendra),
- 3 Setagiri (Sk Shadgiri), and Chakora mountains, whose commands are obeyed by the circles of all kings, whose face is like the pure lotus opened by the rays of the sun, whose (army) animals have drunk the water of three oceans, whose appearance is as beautiful and lovely as the disc of the full moon,
- 4 whose gait is as stately as that of a great elephant, whose arms are as muscular, rounded, broad, long, and beautiful as the body of the lord of serpents, whose hand is fearless and wet by the water held in granting freedom from fear, who is prompt in the service of his mother (even when she is) free from illness, who has well arranged the place and the time for the three pursuits of life (trivarga),
- 5 who is a companion of all the townsmen (his subjects) equal in happiness and in misery, who has humbled the conceit and vanity of Kshatriyas, who is the destroyer of Śakas, Yavanas, and Palhavas, who makes use of (nothing but) the taxes levied according to justice, who never desires to kill an enemy though at fault, who has increased (the prosperity of) the families of Brāhmins and others,
- 6 who has rooted out the dynasty of Kshaharāta (Sk Kshaharāta), who has established the glory of the Śātavāhana family, at whose feet all (royal) circles have bowed, who has stopped the fusion of the four castes, who has conquered multitudes of enemies in numerous battles, whose banner of victory is unconquered, whose excellent capital is unassailable to (his) enemies,
- 7 whose great title of King descended from a succession of ancestors, the depositary of the Śāstras, the

- asylum of good men, the abode of wealth, the fountain of good manners, the only controller, the only archer, the only hero, the only holy man, equal in valour to Rāma,
- 8 Kesava, Arjuna, Bhumsena, who invites assemblies on the festive occasion (which take place) on the declining ayana, equal in majesty to Nābhāga, Nahusha, Janamejaya, Sagara, Yayāti, Rāma, and Ambarisha, who has immeasurably, without loss, without being confounded, and in a way (the like of) which never happened, conquered the host of enemies in the front of the battle, witnessed by Pavana, Garuda, Siddhas, Yakshas, Rākshasas, Vidyādharas, Bhūtas, Gandharvas, Charanas,
- 9 the moon, the sun, the constellations, and the planets, who has pierced the surface of the sky like the summit of mighty mountain, (and) who has raised the family to great wealth
- 10 This great queen, the mother of the great King and the grandmother of the great King, dedicates this dwelling-cave to the congregation of the mendicant assembly of the Bhadrāyani school
- 11 For painting the cave, the hereditary lord of Dakṣhināpatha (?), desirous to serve and desirous to please the venerable lady, has given to Dharmasetu the village of Pisāchī-padraka, with all its rights, to the south-west of the Triraśmi hill

151 *Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi as Overlord and Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi as Provincial Governor* It will be noticed that the titles 'king of kings' (rājarano) and 'mahārājā' have been used in connection with the name of Gautamīputra while Vāsisthīputra has been called 'rājā' and 'mahārājā' (lines 1 and 10). In line 9 Gautamīputra has been called simply Śrī Śātakarṇi which is the name ascribed to him by the purāṇas. Vāsisthīputra has neither the title 'king of kings (rājarano)' nor the designations 'savarājālokamandalapati' (line 3), nor 'savamandalābhivādī-carana' (line 6) meaning 'the lord of all the circles of kings' and 'at whose feet bow circles of all sorts' respectively. The epithets and titles leave no room for doubt that Gautamīputra was the paramount lord and Vāsisthīputra had a subordinate position. Under these circumstances one would naturally expect the inscription to be dated in regnal years of the paramount king, but it is not so, the most plausible explanation is that Balaśrī had been living with her grandson who was a provincial ruler under his father. In view of the importance of the woman in matriarchal families it is also probable that Balaśrī was the regent who governed the province in the name of her grandson.

Vāsisthīputra must have enjoyed a position similar to that of the mahākṣatrapas, he had other provincial rulers with the title 'rājā' under him. This is why Gautamī Balasrī calls herself the 'grandmother of a mahārājā' (line 10) in the inscription. There is no means of ascertaining exactly which regnal year of Gautamīputra would correspond to the year 19 of his son which is the date of the inscription. I shall presently show that an approximate estimate is possible.

152 *Gautamīputra's Territory* The extent of Gautamīputra's territory, as defined in the inscription, has been described by many scholars and I need not go into it again. (Cca pp xxx- )

153 *Purāṇic Tradition in Gautamīputra's Times* Lines 5 and 6 demand special attention. The epithet 'khatiyadapa-mānamadanasa', which means 'one who has humbled the pride and honour of the ksatriyas', suggests that the king himself was not of the ksatriya caste. Had he been a ksatriya the inscription would have said 'who has humbled the pride of other ksatriyas'. This epithet lends support to the purāṇic statement that the Andhras belonged to the śūdra caste. (Bgp-b 12 l 20) The writer of the inscription, it seems, had the intention of conveying the idea that although the king was not a ksatriya he had all the qualifications of the best ksatriya king that ever ruled this earth. The king was keenly alive to the welfare of his subjects, was great in military prowess, exacted only legitimate dues, would not kill his enemies even when they had committed some offence against him, he protected the purity of the castes, his valour and munificence were as great as those of the illustrious purāṇic kings of the past (lines 6-9). This description of Gautamīputra is not to be considered as a mere panegyric. It is a fair description of the king's true character as will appear presently. Incidentally it may be mentioned that the reference in the inscription to Keśava, Arjuna, Bhūmasena, Nābhāga, Nahusa, Janamejaya, Sagara, Yayāti, Rāma and Ambarīṣa, as also to Pavana, Garuda, Siddhas, Yakshas, Rākṣasas, Vidyā-dharas, Bhūtas, Gandharvas, Cāranas, the moon, the sun, the constellations and the planets, clearly prove that the purāṇic tradition was in the first century A.D. as strong as, or even stronger than, it is today. Those who believe that the purāṇas were written down for the first time in the third century A.D. might, with advantage, consider this inscriptional record.

154 *Gautamīputra and his conquered enemies* In line 5 the expression 'sakajavanapalhavanisūdanasa' and in line 6 'khakharātavamsa nirabasesakarasa' do not necessarily mean that Gautamīputra had exterminated all Sakas, Yavanas, Palhavas and Khakharātas. The word 'nisūdana' may mean 'one who removes' (MMW Sed) and the word 'vamśa' has usually been used in the purāṇas with reference to the genealogy of kings that were independent. We may therefore, with perfect justification, take

the two expressions referred to above to mean respectively 'one who has taken away the independence of the Śakas, Yavanas, Palhavas' and 'one who has completely put an end to the independence of the Khikkhātā dynasty'. This interpretation is supported by the sentence intervening between the two expressions. This sentence means that 'the king imposed only such tribute as could be earned fairly and lawfully, he *never killed* his enemies even when they had committed some offence against him, he furthered the prosperity of brāhmanas, of people of other castes (avira) and of his own relations (kuttumba)'. It will be remembered that Gautamīputra gave his son Vāsisthīputra Pulumāvi in marriage to the daughter of Rudradāman who was the grandson of Cistūna, a relation of Kaniska (Jayaswal and B. Bhattacharya *ghos* V p 511 and VI pp 51-53). Rapson is of opinion that Cistūna was probably a Śaka (Cea p civ). Vincent Smith describes Rudradāman as a 'Śaka Satrap' (*Igh* p 139). The marriage of Pulumāvi must have taken place some time after the Balaśrī inscription was inscribed (176, 177, 178 Table XI). Very likely Gautamīputra had contracted other Śaka connections as well. The reference to 'kuttumba' in the inscription, occurring in the place it does, is significant. There is no need therefore to assume that Gautamīputra killed Nahapāna and rooted out his family.

155 *Gautamīputra's ancestors* Gautamīputra was never defeated in any of the numerous battles that he fought with his enemies (line 6), this was something unusual even for great kings, hence the sentence 'in a way the like of which never happened conquered the host of enemies' in line 8. He was the 'only archer, the only hero, the only wise man (eka bāhmanasa)' (line 7). The same line states that Gautamīputra's great title of king descended from a succession of ancestors. Gautamīputra, as I have already shown, was the sixth Andhra king. It is stated in the purāṇas that the first Andhra king Śisuka was a servant (governor) of the Kanvas. It is likely that Śisuka's ancestors were in the same post and enjoyed the title of rājā, hence the reference to a long succession of ancestors.

## 10 THE ORIGIN OF THE ŚAKA ERA

156 *Śakas were no new-comers* The Balaśrī inscription, when considered along with the puranic account and the Śālvāhiana traditions, throws unexpected light on the origin of the Śaka era. It is usually assumed that the Śakas, who ruled as satraps during the Andhra period, came as invaders from outside India and having conquered the territory settled down as rulers. There is no justification for the assumption that the general body of the Śakas, Palhavas and Yavanas were new-comers. Originally, it is true, these people came from outside India but this

XLIII Śakas in  
Ancient India

invasion or the invasions or the immigration must have occurred several centuries earlier than the Andhras. Mention of the Śakas is to be found in Indian literature as having existed in very ancient times.

157 *King Sagara and the Śakas* It is recorded in the purāṇas that king Vāhu, who belonged to the Ikṣvāku dynasty, was deprived of his kingdom by the Haihayas. The Haihayas were helped in this military adventure by various tribes such as the Tāljānghas, the Śakas, the Palhavas, the Pāradas, the Kambojas and the Yavanas. Vāhu's son Sagara (the same Sagara as mentioned in the Balaśrī inscription) succeeded in reconquering his father's territory. He took a terrible revenge on his father's enemies. He killed the majority of the Haihayas he could get hold of and punished their allies in various ways. It appears from the puranic description that even at that remote time these foreign tribes were already Hinduized. They had given up their original culture and were practising Hindu rites. Sagara prevented brāhmanas from helping these foreigners in their religious activities. He issued an edict ordering compulsory shaving of head of all Yavanas, shaving of half the head of the Śakas, wearing of long hairs by the Pāradas and of beards by the Palhavas, as visible distinctive marks of adult persons of these different races. Apparently the Indians used to shave their beards in Sagara's age. (Vip b IV 3 18-21.) In our own times also we have ordinances that compel a Jew to set up distinctive marks of recognition before his business concern or a Hindu youth to carry a distinctive coloured card. The Śakas, Pāradas and other foreigners, punished by Sagara, have been classed with kṣatriyas. There were in ancient times Śaka brāhmanas also who took to astronomy and astrology as their chief pursuit. Even at the present day descendants of these brāhmanas exist in Hindu society. The Śakadvīpi brāhmanas, as they are called, are looked down upon by other brāhmanas.

158 *Indianization of Foreigners* The names of the Śakas of the Andhra period, their religious endowments as recorded in inscriptions, their matrimonial relations, all point to a complete Indianization which must have taken a long time to permeate the general Śaka populace. At the time of the Andhras, the Śakas and Palhavas professed any one or a mixture of the three Indian systems of religion, viz., Hinduism, Jainism and Buddhism, just like persons of true Indian descent at the time. Besides the inscriptional records of the Khakharātas and of the western satraps of the Caṣṭana family, all of which are well known, we have inscriptions recording religious endowments of other Śakas as well, and also of Palhavas and of Yavanas belonging to the various strata of the society. A reference to Lüders List will show the frequency of such endowments. Lüders No 1137 records the gift of Viṣṇudāta the Śakanikā, daughter of the Śaka Agnivarman, made at the time of Mādhariputra Īśvarasena the

Ābhīra, the son of Śivadatta the Ābhīra. The gift is intended for all classes of monks residing on Mount Trīraśmī. Both the husband and the son of Viṣṇudāta were 'ganapakas' or heads of guilds or corporations. Lüders Nos 1148 and 1149 record gifts of the Śaka Dāmachik who describes himself as a 'legbaka' or a scribe. Lüders No 965 records that Rudradāman had a Palhava, named Suvisākha, as a governor under him. The name Suvisākha indicates Indianization. Lüders No 1140 refers to a gift for Buddhist monks made by Indrāgnidatta, son of Dhamma-deva a Yavana. No 1154 records the gift of Yavana Irīla, No 1156 that of Yavana Chamda, No 1182 that of Yavana Chita, No 1096 that of Damma-Yavana, No 1093 that of Yavana Sihādhaya and No 669 that of the Yavana Hehodora of Garudastambha fame who was a devotee of Vāsudeva. I am sure a careful search will reveal other records. No inscription or record referring to the original Śaka or Palhava culture has been discovered in India as far as I know.

159 *Indian names and racial traits of the Śakas*. An occasional Persian or a Scythian name does not prove that the general body of the Śakas maintained their original culture. There is a similarity, sometimes an identity, between ancient Persian and Sanskrit names, e.g., Sarvilaka, Zarathustra, etc. Names ending in 'pāna' as in 'Nahapāna' also occur in the purāṇas. There was a king of the Anga dynasty named 'Anapāna' (Vap-a 99-100), variants of which are 'Khanapāna' and 'Khalapāna' (Bgp-b 9-23-6). The name Ghsamotika (Caṣṭana's father) is probably a misreading for Yasomotika an Indian name. The name of Śiśupāla's father Damaghoṣa in the Mahābhārata reminds one of Damaghsada the satrap. Dāmodara, Dāmoṣṇisha (Mbh. Sabhā 4) are Hindu names having the component 'Dāma' that occurs so frequently in the names of the western satraps. Although the Śakas and Palhavas were thoroughly Indianized they maintained their racial traits and were adepts in acquirement and management of territory. A parallel instance is to be found in the Rajput settlers who immigrated into Bengal about three or four centuries back. Before the advent of the British many of them were independent rulers and at the present time most of the Rajput Sinha Rays, who cannot be distinguished in appearance and culture from the average Bengali, are occupying the position of landlords and show special aptitude for the control and management of property.

160 *Śakāditya and Vikramāditya*. The Śakas and Palhavas of ancient India, like the Jews of the modern world, were sometimes put in responsible positions of State and sometimes persecuted by the reigning powers. The Śakas, Yavanas and Palhavas ruled as independent princes also. Mention of a Yavana king Kāla by name is to be found in the Mahābhārata; he was a terror to the Yādavas, he was killed by the m

of Kṛṣṇa Vikramāditya was a relentless enemy of the Śakas while tradition ascribes the title of 'Śakāditya' or the 'Śaka Sun' to Śāhivāhana (MMW Sed Śaka) Śāhivāhana has been also called 'Śakendia' and even simply 'Śaka'. The following quotations from the Sanskrit-English Dictionary of Monier-Williams and from Śavdakalpadrumah will serve to bring out all the traditions with respect to Śāhivāhana. Under 'Śāhivāhana' Monier-Williams says 'Name of a celebrated sovereign of India (said to be so called either from having ridden on a Yaksha called Śāhi, or from Śāhi or Śāla, the Śāl tree, Śāhivāhana being represented as borne on a cross made of that or other wood, he was the enemy of Vikramāditya and institutor of the era now called Śaka, q v, his capital was Pratasthāna on the Godavari)'. The Śavdakalpadrumah writes under the same heading 'rājāviśeṣaḥ sa tu śakakartā vikramāditya śatruśca', i.e., 'name of king. He is the maker of the Śaka era and enemy of Vikramāditya'.

161 *The Śaka Era* It will be apparent from my previous discussions on Vikramāditya that Śāhivāhana the founder of the Śaka era, with its epoch at 78 A D, cannot possibly be the Śāhivāhana that was the enemy of Vikramāditya who flourished about 57 B C. Tradition has confused the first and sixth Śāhivāhana kings. Śisuka, the first Śāhivāhana Andhra king, was the enemy of Vikramāditya, so Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi, the sixth Śāhivāhana Andhra king, must have been the originator of the Śaka era if we are to believe the puranic dates and the tradition. Under 'Śaka' Śavdakalpadrumah writes 'sa ca nṛpaḥ śakāditya itī śāhivāhana itī ca nāmnā khyātah tasya maraṇadināvadhī vatsara ganānāṅkaḥ śakāvdeṭi nāmnā pañjikā yām likhyate', i.e., 'he is the king Śakāditya also called Śāhivāhana and renowned as such. From the date of his death starts an era that is recorded in the pañjikās (calendars) as śakāvda'. Under 'Śaka' Monier-Williams writes 'described by Kulluka as degraded tribes of Kṣatriyas

they are sometimes regarded as the followers of Śaka or Śāhivāhana'. Under 'Śaka-kāla' is written 'the Śaka era (beginning A D 78 and founded by king Śāhivāhana)'. Under 'Śakāditya' is given 'Name of king Śāhivāhana'. On the other hand, 'Śakāntaka' is 'destroyer of Śakas, Name of king Vikramāditya'. 'Śakāri' is 'enemy of the Śakas, Name of king Vikramāditya'. The synonyms for 'Śakāvda' are 'Śakakāla', 'Śaka-nṛpati-samvatsara', 'Śaka-bhūpa-kāla', 'Śaka-vatsara' and 'Śakendia-kāla'. The above quotations will make it abundantly clear that according to tradition 'Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi' bore the sobriquets 'The Śaka', 'Śakendra' and 'Śakāditya', and that it was he that originated the Śaka era. According to certain traditions he was himself the founder of the era while according to other accounts the era was established in commemoration of his death.



162 *Khakharāta and Śakarāt* The Gautamī Balasri inscription mentions that Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi, who was a great fighter, took away the independence of the Śakas, Yavanas and Palhavas and of the Khakharātas. The Khakharātas have received a separate and specific mention in the inscription, and in their case only the term 'vamsa' meaning a 'reigning dynasty' has been used. This shows that a special importance was attached to them (line 6). It may be assumed that the Khakharāta family was a distinguished reigning dynasty. The origin of the name Khakharāta has not been satisfactorily explained. I venture to suggest that the name in its Sanskrit form is 'Śakarāt' which means 'Śaka emperor'. The title of 'Ekarāt' or 'the sole monarch' as applied to Mahāpadma Nanda may be cited as a parallel (Vap-a 99 327). Being a compound word it was subjected to Prākṛita modifications of the type from which the simple word 'śaka', when used alone, was immune. According to this supposition 'Śakarāt' became 'Śakarāta', then 'Khakarāta', 'Khakharāta', 'Khaharāta' and 'Chaharāda', the last form occurring in Kharosthi characters only. Naha-pāna, the Ksaharāta, in spite of his Persian sounding name, was according to this supposition a Śaka. His son-in-law Usabhadāta was certainly a Śaka (bg Vol XVI p 577 line 2 of Inscription 14).

163 *Prestige of the Andhra Dynasty was re-established by Gautamīputra* If I have made a correct guess it may be assumed that a powerful Śaka dynasty existed at the time of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi, and that the kings of this dynasty used the title 'Śakarāt' meaning 'Śaka Emperor'. The Śakarāts, it may be further assumed, usurped some of the territory that belonged to the Andhras. This may be supposed to have happened some time after the death of Śisuka the first king. It is impossible to guess, in the present state of our knowledge, who must have been the first Śakarāt. Gautamīputra vanquished the Śakarāt emperor of his time and won back the ancestral dominion. We find in line 6 of the inscription, immediately following the expression 'khakharāta va[m]sanirabasesakarasa' (one who has completely ousted the Khakharāta dynasty), the words sātavāhanakulayasa patithapanakarasa' which mean 'one who has established the prestige and glory (yasa) of the Sātavāhana family'.

164 *Gautamīputra's efforts at popularity* The name and fame of Vikramāditya and his romantic career must have been prominent in the public mind at the time of Gautamīputra. The Andhras, on the other hand, being śūdras and being usurpers of the throne belonging to a brāhmana dynasty by the crime of murder were naturally looked upon with a certain amount of unreverence and disrespect by the people. An expression of this public attitude is to be found in the nicknames of the early Andhra kings as found in the purāṇas. Gautamīputra after

his great victory over the Khakharātas, must have thought of retrieving the position of his family. To win popularity he became generous towards his enemies (line 5), he celebrated religious functions and organized feasts and public festivities in lavish style imitating the munificence of past renowned puranic kings (line 8). He declared himself a patron of the Śakas he had conquered, assumed the title of Śakāditya after having ousted the Śakarāts or Khakharātas, perhaps as a counterblast to the memory of Vikramāditya. While Vikramāditya was an avowed enemy of the Śakas and was known by the sobriquet 'Śakāri', Gautamīputra declared himself a friend and patron of the Śakas. In later years he married his son to the daughter of Rudradāman, who was certainly of non-Indian descent and probably a Śaka (154). Gautamīputra was also known as 'Śakendra' or 'lord of the Śakas'.

165 *Conciliatory Policy of Gautamīputra* A parallel to Gautamīputra's conciliatory policy towards the Śakas is to be found in English history. When the Anglo-Saxons began to settle in different parts of England the surviving Britons were gradually driven westward and came to be known as the Welsh or 'strangers'. A Welsh prince, Llewellyn by name, rose in rebellion against Edward I but was killed in battle about 1281 A.D. The other Welsh chieftains submitted to Edward, and Wales was joined to England. Edward was desirous of securing the willing loyalty of the newly acquired province. He promised to the chieftains to give them a ruler who was 'born in their own land, could not speak a word of English, and never did wrong to man, woman or child'. When he was asked to carry out his promise, he showed his infant son, Edward, who was born in Carnarvon in 1284. The chieftains accepted little Edward as their prince. From that time the eldest son of the English sovereign has always received the title of Prince of Wales. It was exactly by a similar process that Gautamīputra Śātakarni, the conqueror of the Śakas, came to be regarded as 'Śakāditya', 'Śakendra' and even 'the Śaka' by the general populace of his time.

166 *The Starting of the Śaka Era* To commemorate his victory Gautamīputra started an era which came to be known both as the Śālivāhana era and the Śaka era. This served to act as a second counterblast to Vikramāditya's reputation. Just as Vikramāditya's era got popular through the astronomers and astrologers of his court who prepared almanacs fixing the times and dates of different Hindu festivals and religious functions in terms of Vikrama Samvat, so in the case of the Śaka era also State astronomers helped to popularize its use by incorporating it in the almanacs. Both the Vikrama Samvat and the Śālivāhana Śakābda are mentioned side by side in Indian calendars even at the present time. Although Śālivāhana Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni could not oust the Vikrama era, he succeeded

in establishing his own era on a permanent footing. The Kāla-  
era, which I have already shown to be a modified form of the  
Nanda era, the Vikrama Samvat and the Śāhivāhana Śakāyda are  
the only three Hindu eras that have acquired an all-India  
currency. They have survived in calendars to this day. J. F.  
Eleet is also of opinion that the Saka era was popularized by the  
astronomers. (The Saka Era, p. 1910 p. 822) The tradition  
that says that the Śaka era was started to commemorate the  
death of a great Śaka king is also true in the sense that Gautami-  
putra became Śakāditya after having conquered the reigning  
Khakharāta or the Śaka emperor. It is likely the Khakharāta  
king died in the fight. The death of this king would thus  
naturally coincide with the victory of Gautamīputra. In con-  
nection with the question of the origin of the Śaka era the follow-  
ing quotation from 'Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum' Vol II  
Part I 'Kharosthi Inscriptions' by Stein Konow, Introduction,  
p. xviii is interesting. 'After some time (*Kālāntarena lenai*),  
Vikramāditya, king of Mālava, ousted this Śaka dynasty (*up-  
pādā sagāna tam tamsam*). But also his dynasty was uprooted  
(*tassa vi tamsam uppādātūna*), by another Śaka King (*Sagarāyā*),  
who established an era of his own when 135 years of the Vikrama  
era had elapsed (*panatise tāsasae Vikramasamvachchharassa*  
*etolne parnatitūna thavio jenam samvachchharo niyao*). It is  
then added that this incident has been narrated (*eyam pāsam-  
giyam samalāhāyam*) in order to give information about the  
(origin of the) Śaka era (*Sagalājanan-attham*). (Kāla-  
lāchāryakathānaka, a work of unknown date)

167 Western Satraps were Tributaries to the Andhras. The  
regnal dates of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni ranging from 74 A D  
to 130 A D, within which period the epoch of the Śaka era falls,  
as also the traditional and the inscriptional evidence go to  
support the assumption that the Śaka era was started by the sixth  
Andhra king Śrī Śātakarni. Once this is admitted it will be  
seen that there is no alternative but to recognize that the western  
satraps, who dated in Śaka era, were tributaries to the Andhras  
In this connection the title 'Śakendra' (Lord of the Śakas) that  
tradition ascribes to Śāhivāhana appears to be significant (161)  
Rapson writes 'That the dates of the Western Ksatrapas are  
actually recorded in years of the Śaka era, beginning in 78 A D,  
p. 365) The question of the origin of this era has, therefore,  
an important bearing on the history of this dynasty. The  
Western Ksatrapas were originally feudatories, and the era used  
by them is presumably, as is regularly the case in similar instances,  
the era of the dynasty to which they paid allegiance' (Cca  
p. cv)

168 *Appointments of Bhūmaka, Caṣṭana and Pulumāvi as Provincial Governors*

XLV Gautamī  
putra and Western  
Satraps

The evidence in favour of the Andhra origin of the Śaka era is fairly conclusive. We may now safely attempt a little historical reconstruction to elucidate

the position of the western satraps during the time of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni. Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni ascended the throne in 74 A D. After having established himself firmly he led an expedition sometime before A D 78 against the Khakharāta king, one of whose ancestors had wrested a part of the Andhra dominion. Gautamīputra succeeded in completely ousting the Khakharāta monarch from all his possessions and also in subjugating various other tribes of Śakas, Palhavas and Yavanas. He acquired immense wealth by his military victories (line 9, Balaśrī inscription). He started an era in commemoration of the victory in A D 78. In pursuance of the conciliatory policy that he adopted towards his vanquished enemies he appointed Bhūmaka, a scion of the Khakharāta family, to the governorship of the province of Mahārāṣṭra and Caṣṭana, probably a member of some other family (Kardamaka?) conquered by him, to the satrapy of the Mālavas. These appointments seem likely to have been made shortly after 78 A D. About this period he also placed his mother Gautamī Balaśrī as the regent in the Dakṣiṇāpatha in charge of his minor son Pulumāvi. Sometime between 100 and 130 A D his son was married to the daughter of Rudradāman the grandson of Caṣṭana. All the satraps under Gautamīputra including Uṣabhadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna, dated their records in terms of the Śaka era. Gautamīputra neither killed Nahapāna nor did he restrike Nahapāna's coins in commemoration of his victory over him. Nahapāna, Caṣṭana, Uṣabhadāta and Rudradāman were all satraps under the protection of the suzerain Gautamīputra. None of the western satraps were independent kings although they used the title of 'rājā' and minted coins in their own names.

11 QUEEN BALAŚRĪ, QUEEN JIVASŪTĀ AND GAUTAMĪPUTRA  
ŚRĪ ŚĀTAKARNI

169 *Gautamīputra's Inscription*

XLVI Gautamī  
putra and Uṣabha  
dāta Jivasūtā  
Inscription

I shall now consider the inscriptions in which Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni figures. I give below the translations of two inscriptions by Bhagvanlal Indraji, numbered 1125 and 1126 by Lüders. Nāsik, Pandu-Lena Caves, Inscription 4 (p 558-

bg Vol XVI ls 1125) Translation by Bhagvanlal Indraji (For transliteration of the inscription, see ap)

- (1) To the Perfect one From Benūkatāka of Govardhana, which is the camp of victory of the Vajrayanti army, the illustrious lord Śātakarni, son of Gautamī,

- (2) commands the minister Viślinupālita in Govardhana, that (whereas) there is at the present day a field in the village of Aparakakhadī (Aparakakshātī?) owned by Rishabhadatta,
- (3) and (measuring) 200 nīvartanas, this our field (measuring) 200 nīvartanas, we give to the Tekirasi ascetics of this (mountain) We grant rights (immunity?) in connection with this field
- (4) It is not to be entered, not to be injured, not to be worked for salt (?), to be freed from all ordinary local dues (?) These are the immunities granted to this field
- (5) This document has been written here by Suvīya (Suvīrya), it has been commanded by the minister Sivaguta (Sivagupta), touched by the great lord
- (6) The plate (which was) kept (was) given on the first day of the second fortnight of the rainy season in the year 18 for the use of recluses

170 *Jīvasūtā's Inscription* Inscription 5 (ls 1126 )  
 (Line 6 of Inscription 4 continued ) (For transliteration of the inscription, see ap)

- (6) To the Perfect one The gift by the minister Sāmaka from the Queen
- (7) Health to be inquired of Sāmaka, the minister at Govardhana, at the command of Jīvasūtā, the queen Dowager, the great queen of King Gantamiputra Sātākarni,
- (8, 9) and he to be told 'Here we had given a field in the east in the village of Kakhadī to the recluse mendicants living in the cave, charitably given by us in mount Triraśmi That field is being cultivated (but) the village is uninhabited
- (10) Such being the case we now give a hundred (100) nīvartanas of the royal field in our possession on the confines of the city to the recluse mendicants of Triraśmi
- (11) We grant parihāra (immunity?) to this field It is not to be entered, not to be injured, not to be dug for salt, and to be free from the ordinary dues of the country, with all kinds of immunities Such being the immunities let none take the field 'Do you record here the parihāra (immunity?) of this field', is the command of Suvīya (Suvīrya) In the year 24
- (12) on the fifth (5) day of the fourth fortnight of the monsoon months, the writing on the plate has been engraved here at the command of the Queen The documents for the ascetics (had been) prepared

in the year 24 on the tenth day of the second fortnight of the summer months

171 *Jīvasūtā the name of Gautamīputra's Queen* With reference to the inscription No 1126 Rapson writes 'This is an order of the king to be communicated to Syāmaka, the minister in Govardhana, "in the name of the king Gautamīputra and of the king's queen-mother whose son is living" The name of this queen, Bala-Śrī, is known from her inscription dated in the 19th year of her grandson Puṣumāvi' (Cea p xlviii) According to Bhagvanlal Indraji there is no reference to Balaśrī in this inscription, the queen who makes the gift is named 'Jīvasūtā', she is the great queen of king Gautamīputra Śātakarni and not his mother The word 'jīvasūtā' in line 7 of the inscription has been supposed by Rapson and some other scholars to mean 'whose son is living' The original passage is 'raño gotamīputasa satakanisa mahādeviya ca jīvasutāya rājamātuya vacanena, etc' The meaning is quite clear Indraji's rendering of 'jīvasūtā' as the name of Gautamīputra's queen is certainly the correct one The translation of 'jīvasūtā' by the words 'whose son is living' leads to an absurd expression, viz, 'in the name of the king Gautamīputra and of the king's queen-mother whose son is living' As, according to this interpretation, the inscription distinctly states that the order is in the name of king Gautamīputra there is no sense in saying that the queen-mother's son, who must be the same king, is alive I propose the following translation [Line 6] Siddham (Perfection) The minister Sāmaka at Govardhana to make the [following] gift from the Queen [Line 7] According to the directions of King Gautamīputra Śātakarni's Queen Consort [who is] also the Queen-mother Jīvasūtā, Sāmaka at Govardhana is to be enquired of [his] good health and then [line 8] he is to be told, etc

172 *Gautamīputra did not act as a Provincial Governor* We may, therefore, safely assume that while inscription Is 1125 records the gift of king Gautamīputra, inscription Is 1126, which is a continuation of No 1125, records that of his queen The expression 'rājamātuya' refers to the fact that Jīvasūtā was the mother of Puṣumāvi Jīvasūtā must have belonged to the Vāsīṣṭhi gotra The time interval between the dates of the two inscriptions Nos 1125 and 1126 is six years Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni enjoyed a reign of 54 years from 74 a C to 130 a C It may be assumed that he did not act in the capacity of a provincial governor any time previous to his accession The long reign of 54 years is not an impossibility Inscription No 1125, which is dated in the 18th year of the king, was therefore executed some time about  $(74+18=)$  92 a C, and the inscription of the queen Jīvasūtā about 98 a C

173 *Camp of Victory* It is not necessary to assume that the word 'vijayakhadhāvāra' occurring in line 1 of No 1125, the

literal meaning of which is 'the camp of victory' implies that the king had just returned from an actual victorious campaign. The word 'jayaskandhāvāra' is a common one occurring in many inscriptions and copper-plate grants (cf. Dahrasena's copper-plate record Cea p lxiii). It merely indicates 'the place of residence' of the king at the time. The royal camp is likely to have been called 'the camp of victory' irrespective of the state of peace or war, particularly in the case of a king who never suffered defeat (line 6 ls 1123). The visits to Govardhana were certainly made in the course of pilgrimage, and the queen accompanied the king on the first occasion also, in line 8 of inscription No. 1126 the expression 'amhehi puvakhetam datam' which means 'we gave a field as a gift', refers to the previous joint visit of the king and the queen although in the inscription (ls 1125) only the king's name is to be found.

174 *Significance of gift of Usabhadāta's lands made by Gautamīputra*. The land that the king made a gift of previously belonged to one Usabhadāta (line 2, ls 1125). This Usabhadāta may or may not be the Usabhadāta the son-in-law of Nahapāna. There is nothing in the inscription to suggest that Usabhadāta's lands were taken possession of by Gautamīputra after the former had been defeated in battle. Had such been the case there would have been found some reference to victory in the passage. It was customary for kings to make gifts of lands belonging to persons who might be his subjects by paying the proper price to the owner and acquiring them. Usabhadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna, records in inscription ls 1131, line 4, that he paid 4,000 karsapānas to a brāhmana as price for the field that he donated. It is likely, therefore, that Gautamīputra similarly paid the price of the land to Usabhadāta when he took it from him. Even when any land happened to be in the king's direct possession the king was expected to pay its price to the State treasury from his personal funds before he could make a gift of it.

175 *Renewal of privileges was not necessary*. If we compare the Karle inscriptions of Gautamīputra (ls 1105) and Uṣabhadāta (ls 1099), we shall find that a village named Karajika or Karajaka, that had been given as gift to the monks of Vāloraka cave by Uṣabhadāta, was also donated by Gautamīputra probably in the year 18 of his reign. This fact has been interpreted to mean that the edict in inscription No. 1105 'was issued by Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni as a result of his victory over Nahapāna' for the 'renewal of privileges previously granted by Rṣabhadatta' (Cea p xlix). During the Andhra period it was customary to invest all gifts for the purpose of administration in guilds of various classes of artisans. Thus there would be no occasion for the 'renewal of privileges' even when there was a change of the ruling dynasty. It is to be noted

that Uṣabhadāta's inscription is undated, and that in Gautamīputra's inscription no mention is to be found that the village of Karajaka previously belonged to Uṣabhadāta. Since both the inscriptions are to be found close to each other they can both be read by a person visiting the place. It is and was not possible for visitors to find out who was the earlier donor and to whom the merit of the gift should belong. Had the change of donor taken place as a result of victory of one over the other the inscription of the victor would have recorded the fact. The only plausible explanation is that the village must have been donated by Uṣabhadāta originally and that it was paid for by Gautamīputra when he made a second gift of it. It was not possible for anybody, who knew that Gautamīputra was the king, to make any mistake regarding the final donor, because Gautamīputra and Uṣabhadāta stood in the relation of overlord and satrap, they were not two independent kings.

176 *Uṣabhadāta's Overlord* In the inscription, Lüders No 1131, Uṣabhadāta says that in obedience to the order of 'bhattāraka' (postscript 1) he led an expedition against the Mālayas. It has been supposed that the word 'bhattāraka' refers to Uṣabhadāta's overlord who was his father-in-law Nahapāna. It must be remembered that Nahapāna did not use the honorific 'śri' with his name, he called himself a kṣatrapa and could never claim the epithet 'bhattāraka' which means 'the great lord' (Sed) and which was used only by independent kings. In his inscription Uṣabhadāta apparently referred to Gautamīputra at whose order he set out against the Mālayas. We do not find in any inscription anything that might go against the supposition that the western satraps were tributaries to the Andhras. I have already discussed the significance of Rudradāman's claims, in the Gumar inscription, Lüders No 965, of having defeated the lord of the Deccan twice in battle (50) Rudradāman's victory as well as his daughter's marriage must be dated sometime before 130 A D.

177 *Pulumāvi's Regnal Years Date of Balaśrī's death*

XLVII Gautamī  
putra, Pulumāvi  
and Balaśrī

An attempt may now be made to determine the correspondence of dates between the regnal years of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni and those of his son Vāsiṣṭhīputra Pulumāvi.

Unfortunately the available data are not adequate for a definite conclusion. We find Pulumāvi's date 19 in the Balaśrī inscription. If it is assumed that Balaśrī was the regent in charge of Pulumāvi and that she was placed in Dakṣiṇāpatha immediately after the great victory of Gautamīputra, the accession of Pulumāvi, who must have been a minor at the time, to the provincial throne would be dated about the year 78 A D. There would thus be a difference of 4 years only between the regnal dates of the father and the son, Gautamīputra having become king in 74 A C. In the Jivasūtā inscription, Lüders 1126,



the names of Gautamīputra and his consort Jivasūtā occur together while in the Balaśrī inscription the name of Gautamīputra is mentioned along with that of his mother. According to Indian custom so long as the mother-in-law is living the daughter-in-law would not find any prominent mention anywhere. It may be pointed out that in inscription No 1125, of which the Jivasūtā inscription is a continuation, so to say, there is no mention of the queen although, as I have already pointed out, the queen accompanied the king on the pilgrimage (173). Six years intervened between the two inscriptions. It may therefore be surmised that Balaśrī died in the interval, and Jivasūtā allowed her name to be recorded after her mother-in-law's death. The date of Balaśrī's death on this supposition would fall between  $(74+18=)$  92 a C and 98 a C. The 19th year of Pulumāvi's reign at which date Balaśrī was alive would be  $(78+19=)$  97 a C. There is therefore no discrepancy between the two assumptions. The death of Balaśrī may be fixed at 98 a C. Again, supposing Gautamīputra was 20 years old at the time of his accession, and supposing he was born at his mother's 20th year, Balaśrī's birth date would be  $(74-20-20=)$  34 a C. Balaśrī would thus be about  $(98-34=)$  64 years old at the time of her death. In inscription, Lüders No 1124, Vāsiṣṭhīputra has been called 'navanarasāmi'. The word has been taken to mean 'the new lord' by Indrajī. If we accept this interpretation we might say that Pulumāvi took over independent charge of the province after the death of his grandmother, that is why he was called 'the new lord'. The inscription is dated in his 22nd year. Therefore Balaśrī died between the years 19 and 22 of Pulumāvi's reign, i.e., between 97 a C and 100 a C. This tallies with the other suppositions.

178 78 A D as Key-date of Gautamīputra's Times. The

XLVIII Chro  
nology of Gautamī  
putra's Times

assumption that Pulumāvi's regnal years began in 78 A D may therefore be accepted. The dates for Gautamīputra (74 a C-130 a C), Pulumāvi (78 A D-148 a C), Bhūmaka, Nahapāna, Usabhadāta and Āyāma (78 A D-124 a C) Ysamotika, Caṣṭana, Jayadāman and Rudradāman (78 A D-150 a C) and the fact that the western satraps were feudatory to the Andhras will explain the shuffling of territory that is supposed to have taken place by Rapson and others (Cca pp cxx, cxxi). The epoch of the Śaka era 78 A D is the key-date of Andhra chronology of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni's times. See Table XI.

## TABLE XI CHRONOLOGY OF GAUTAMĪPUTRA ŚRĪ ŚĀTAKARNĪ'S TIMES

- 34 a C Gautamī Balaśrī's birth (approximate date )  
 54 a C Gautamīputra's birth (approximate date )  
     73 a C Pulumāvi's birth (approximate date )  
 74 a C Gautamīputra's accession  
 78 A D Gautamīputra starts Śaka era  
     78 A D Pulumāvi as provincial governor of the Dakṣiṇā-  
         patha under Balaśrī  
 78 A D Balaśrī as regent in charge of Pulumāvi  
     78 A D Bhūmaka or his son Nahapāna is  
         appointed Satrap of Mahārāṣṭra  
     78 A D Ysamotika or his son Caṣṭana  
         is appointed Satrap of  
         Mālava  
 92 a C Gautamīputra makes a gift of Uṣabhadāta's lands  
 97 a C Balaśrī inscription  
 98 a C Balaśrī's death  
 98 a C Jīvasūtā inscription  
     119 A D } Uṣabhadāta's inscriptions  
     123 A D }  
     124 A D Āyāma inscription  
 130 a C Gautamīputra's death  
     130 a C Pulumāvi's accession  
     148 a C Pulumāvi's death  
     150 A D Rudradāman's coin

Caṣṭana's date lies between 78 a C and 124 a C Rudradāman's daughter's marriage with Pulumāvi took place some time between, say, 100 a C and 130 a C, Rudradāman defeated his son in law also some time between these dates

## 12 QUEEN NĀYANIKĀ AND GAUTAMĪPUTRA YAJÑASRĪ ŚĀTAKARNĪ

179 *Nanaghat Inscriptions and Epigraphic Evidence* I shall now consider the Nanaghat inscriptions of queen Nāyanikā or Nāganikā. These inscriptions are numbered 1112 to 1118 in the XLIX Nana ghat Inscriptions Queen Nāyanikā Lüders List. There is difference of opinion among scholars as regards the relation the different individuals, mentioned in the inscriptions, bear to one another. The incubus of epigraphic oracle has prevented historians from arriving at unbiassed opinions in their discussions of these famous inscriptions. I have already shown that we can safely brush aside epigraphic verdict if it clashes with other evidence (51-61), and this remark is particularly applicable to the present case.

180 *The Images and Names* These inscriptions are found on the walls of a large cave at the top of the Nanaghat pass that leads from the Konkan to Junar in West Poona. The cave was very likely a rest-chamber for ascetics. On the two side-walls are long lines of inscriptions recording various gifts made in connection with Vedic sacrifices by the queen Nāyanikā, mother of prince Vedisirī. On the left wall there are 10 lines of inscriptions and on the right wall also 10. On the back wall there were originally 9 relievo figures now entirely destroyed. Above the

heads of the figures are inscriptions, apparently showing the names of the personages represented by the figures. The inscriptions over the respective positions of the 9 figures are given below

- (1) Rāvā Simuka Sātavāhana śrīmata
- (2) Devī Nāyanikāya rano cha
- (3) Śrī Sātakanmo
- (4) Kumāro Bhūya
- (5) (Inscription lost)
- (6) ( " )
- (7) Mahārathi Trānakaviro (Bühler) or  
Maharathagrianka Yiro (Indrap)
- (8) Kumāro Hakusiri
- (9) Kumāro Sātavāhana

181 *The Date of Nanaghat Inscriptions* The inscriptions on the side-walls mention (i) Kumāra Vedisiri and another person apparently (ii) a king whose name ended in 'siri' and (iii) whose wife was the mother of Vedisiri and Satī Śrīmata and lastly (iv) a mahārathi. The names over the heads of the figures and in the inscriptions on the side-walls have been supposed to correspond. Vedisiri is perhaps referred to as 'kumaro sātavāhana' the name over figure 9, Satī Śrīmata as 'Kumaro Hakusiri' the name over figure 5 and the mother of Vedisiri and Satī Śrīmata as 'Devī Nāyanikā' the name over figure 2. Rāvā Simuka Sātavāhana has been supposed by most scholars to have been the father of the king whose name ends in 'siri' in the inscription. This is an entirely gratuitous assumption. I am inclined to place the inscriptions and Devī Nāyanikā and others some time between 412 a C and 418 a C for reasons mentioned below. The conservatism of State engravers as also the presence of other inscriptions near at hand, which served as epigraphic models to them, would explain the old form of the Nanaghat script.

182 *Seven Andhrabhrtyas and twenty-three Andhras* The purāṇas state that there were 19 Andhra kings (Mtp-a 273 16) followed by 7 Andhrabhrtyas who were also of the Andhra race (Mtp-a 273 17, 18, Vap-a 99 358 359). This gives us  $(19+7=)$  26 successive kings. The purāṇas do not say anything specifically about the last 4 kings. Since all the 30 kings were Andhras and since only 7 have been definitely stated to be Andhrabhrtyas the remaining 23 must have been Andhras other than Andhrabhrtyas. Of these 23 the first 19 ruled before the 7 Andhrabhrtyas. The reign of the Andhrabhrtyas began with the 20th king and ended with the 26th. The last 4 kings must therefore be Andhras of the old stock. This puranic account may fit the inscriptional records if we assume that the Vīlvaśakuras and Śivalakuras were Andhrabhrtyas. King No 23 who has been called Gautamiputra and who has been wrongly identified with the Gautamiputra Śrī Sātakarni of the inscriptions, must then

taken to be Gautamīputra Vīlvāyakura. His predecessor king No 22, called Śivasvātī or Śivasvāmi, would be identified with Mātharīputra Svāmi Sakasena or Sakasada, and kings No 20 and No 21 with Vāsiṣṭhīputra Vīlvāyakura and Mātharīputra Śivalakura respectively. The Baleokouros of Hippokouros of Ptolemy (c 150 A D) cannot be any of these Vīlvāyakuras as the dates for kings No 20, No 21 and No 23 range from 307 a C to 361 a C. It is probable that the Vīlvāyakuras had been ruling as hereditary provincial governors from an early time before they came to occupy the imperial throne. However nice the fit may be, it should be kept in mind that in the absence of dates in inscriptions and coins of these kings their respective identities with the puranic kings remain always a proposition of doubtful value even when similarity of names can be found. We may tentatively accept these identifications so long as any conflicting evidence is not forthcoming.

183 *Andhra sub-clans and the meaning of the word Vīlvāyakura* According to Vāyu 99 358 the L Andhra Sub Clans Andhras were divided into five sub-clans which were all contemporaneous. The sub-clans may be surmised to have been as follows (1) the Śātavāhanas, (2) the Cuṭus, (3) the Mudās, (4) the Vīlvāyas and (5) the Ābhīras. Regarding the name Vīlvāyakura it may be pointed out that the word 'vāya' means 'leader' (Sed) 'Vīlvāya' means 'leader or lord of vīli'. 'Kura' is the same as 'kula' or 'kuda' or 'kada' (as in Cuṭukadānanda) and means 'sub-clan' or 'family'. There is an author named Vīlnātha Kavī who wrote a drama called 'Madanmañjarī Nāṭaka' (Burnell, 170a. A classified index to the Sanskrit manuscripts in the Palace at Tanjore. London 1880). The name 'Vīlnātha' is identical in meaning with 'Vīlvāya'. Vīlnātha might have been very well the name of a local Śiva image. The ancient town of Vellore (North Arcot) used to be known as Vella (MMW Sed), and Vīlnātha was probably the deity of the place. If this guess be correct Śivalakura and Vīlvāyakura would refer to the same sub-clan, the sub-clan derived its name from the presiding deity of the place. According to the purāṇas there were 10 Ābhīra kings who were also Andhrabhṛtyas. Their rule, like that of the other 7 Andhrabhṛtyas mentioned in the same śloka, was contemporaneous with the rule of the Andhras and was included in the total period of Andhra reign (Vap-a 99 358, 359, Mtp-a 273 17, 18). The Ābhīras were thus Andhras and belonged to one of the royal sub-clans. Īsvarsena, Īsvardatta and the other Ābhīras were not interlopers as has been supposed by some scholars. That the Ābhīras belonged to a royal sub-clan of the Andhras explains the fact that Īsvardatta, although he was a mere mahākṣatrapa, dated his records in regnal years. It is probable that there were 10 Ābhīra kings of the Traikūṭaka family counting backwards from Dahrasena.

184 *The last 4 Śātavāhanas* We may therefore assume that the reign of the Śātavāhana sub-clan ended with the death of the 19th king. After this the imperial Andhra throne passed into the hands of other Andhra sub-clans whose rule ended with the 26th king. The Śātavāhanas were re-established on the throne from the time of Yaṣṇasrī the 27th king till the end of the dynasty in 435 a C. Pulomā was the 30th and the last Śātavāhana king.

185 *Hindu Religious Revival* It is likely that although the early Andhra kings of the Śātavāhana sub-clan followed Hindu ideals and traditions, as can be seen from the Balaśrī inscription, the later Andhrabhrtyas were more inclined towards Buddhism and Jainism. The large number of gifts made to monks of these faiths may be taken as an index of their popularity. When the Śātavāhanas re-established themselves as paramount lords they tried to revive Hindu religious practices. The name Yaṣṇasrī the first of the later Śātavāhanas is itself an indication of Hindu religious revival. It may be surmised that the Nanaghat inscriptions were executed at the order of Nāyanikā, the queen of Yaṣṇasrī Śātakarṇi, after the death of her husband at the time when Vijaya the 28th king was on the throne, i.e., between 412 and 418 a C. Vijaya might have been a brother of Yaṣṇasrī. Nāyanikā was perhaps the regent in charge of her minor son Vedisiri who was the provincial governor of the Dakṣiṇā-patha (line 2, left wall). She appears to have acted in the same capacity for her son as Balaśrī had done for Pulumāvi.

186 *Meaning of the name Hakusiri* Nāyanikā celebrated vedic sacrifices on a lavish scale. Her son was named Vedisiri the Sanskrit equivalent of which would be Vedaśrī. Her other son was named Hakusiri which is very likely the Prākṛita form of Sūktaśrī meaning 'the grace of vedic sūkta or mantra'. Sūktaśrī would be converted into Śaktuśrī and then into Hakusiri in Prākṛita. Bühler writes 'Hakusiri, which, according to the method of spelling used in ancient inscriptions, may stand for Hakkusiri, would correspond exactly to Sanskrit Śaktuśrī, "he whose glory is the (sacrificial) barley-flour"' (aswī V p 64 n). The occurrence of the name 'Satī Sīrīmata' in line 4, left wall, has led Bühler and others to identify him with Kumāro Hakusiri of the relief figure. Bühler writes 'Now if Śakti is the Sanskrit etymon of Satī, it is quite possible that Haku, which, according to the method of spelling adopted in the old inscriptions, may stand for Hakku, is another stronger prakrit corruption of Śakti' (ibid, p 68). In my opinion the original name of the prince was Sūktaśrī which suffered change in two

'was dead at the time when the inscription was incised' (*ibid*, p 69)

187 *Vedaśrī, Vadaśrī and Cadasāti* It is quite in the fitness of things that the two sons of Yajñaśrī should have been named Sūktaśrī and Vedaśrī In the purāṇas the name of the 29th king shows several variant forms, *e g*, Candraśrī (Viṣṇu), Candaśrī (Mtp-a), Dandaśrī (Vap-a) and Vadaśrī (Radcliffe Mtp, Vip-w IV p 201) The last name Vadaśrī may be taken to be a corrupt form of Vedaśrī In coins we find the name 'Vāsisthīputa Śrī Cada Sāti' Referring to the coins of this king Rapson remarks that his name is spelt in two ways, *viz*, either with a dental or with a lingual d (Cca p 30 n) The name of the king has been called Vada Śātakarni by Vincent Smith (*ibid*) Support is thus found from coins for almost all the variant names recorded by the purāṇas Chinese records describe this king as Yue-ai, *i e*, Candraśrī

188 *Vāsisthīputra Vedaśrī* Yajñaśrī has been called Gautamīputra in inscriptions and coins Gautamīputra's wife cannot belong to Gautama gotra She may be a Vāsisthī The queen of the sixth Andhra king the great Gautamīputra was a Vāsisthī It appears that Nāyanikā, the queen of Yajñaśrī Gautamīputra, was also a Vāsisthī, her son Vedisiri may be taken to be the Vadasiri of the coins who was a Vāsisthīputra

189 *Śisuka is probably the correct name of the first Andhra King* Now coming to the name Simuka that appears over the first relievo figure Bhagvanlal Indraji writes 'Dr Bühler has suggested that Simuka the first statue in the Nanaghat chamber is Śisuka, the first name which occurs in the Matsya Purāṇ list This suggestion seems probable and is supported by the consideration that the Śipraka of the Viṣṇu, the Sindhuka of the Vayu, and the Śisuka of the Matsya Purāṇs appear to be all corruptions of the Nanaghat name Simuka, arising from a misreading of the letter *mu*, a mistake which seems to have been made about the fourth or fifth century At that time *mu* might be read either as *pra*, *shu* or *dhu*, and each Purāṇ writer adopted the reading he thought to be the best And as Sishuka and Sidhuka seemed meaningless names they were changed into Śisuka and Sindhuka' (bg XVI p 612) Chances are against the assumption that the first Andhra king had a name without a meaning During the Andhra period even Śakas, Yavanas and Palhavas sported Sanskrit names If in the fifth century A D it was possible to read *mu* as *shu* the reverse was also true As the Nanaghat inscription was executed some time after 412 A C it might be that the original name Śisuka in the copy was read as Simuka by the engraver Then again there is another possibility The letter 'śa' occurs rarely in Prākṛita words and it is likely that many variants of this letter existed one of which resembled 'ma' To my eye the letter supposed to be 'ma'

LII Simuka and  
Śisuka

in the word read as 'Simuka' appears to be somewhat different from the other ma's, e g, in the word 'kumara' occurring in the Nanaghat inscription. The upper part of the middle letter in the word read as 'Simuka' resembles more a V than the half circle of other ma's. There is just the possibility that the letter is 'śa' and not 'ma'. The resemblance would be explained by the supposition that the inscription was executed at a time when the two letters could be confused. The occurrence of sporadic forms of letters in inscriptions is not a rarity. Vincent Smith writes 'Many alphabetical forms specially characteristic of Gupta inscriptions are found sporadically in Kuṣāna records (see No 46 of List of Inscriptions) while on the other hand, Gupta documents often exhibit archaic forms specially characteristic of the Kuṣāna age' (The Kuṣān Period of Indian History, Jras 1913 p 35)

190 *Nanaghat Inscriptions were very likely executed by the Queen of Yajñaśrī*. The assumption that the Nanaghat inscriptions were executed by the queen of Yajñaśrī is thus seen to be supported by the following arguments: (i) the names Sūktāśrī and Vedaśrī of the princes are in conformity with the name Yajñaśrī of the father. The worn out name of the king in the inscription ends with a 'śrī', (ii) vedic rites in place of Buddhist ceremonies were likely to have been inaugurated by royal personages on the re-establishment to the throne of the Śātavāhana sub-clan. This occurred at the time of Yajñaśrī, i e, about 403 A C, (iii) the placing of relievo figure of Śisuka the first Śātavāhana, the founder of the dynasty, along with those of the other members of Yajñaśrī's family to emphasize the fact that the Śātavāhana sub-clan was re-established, (iv) the identification of Vedisrī with the 29th king, and (v) lastly the probable occurrence of a sporadic form of the letter 'śa' peculiar to the fifth century A D in the inscription. In spite of the plausibility of the above arguments it must be kept in mind that since the Nanaghat inscriptions bear no date the identifications cannot be considered as certain. Incidentally it may be mentioned that Yajñaśrī's queen Nāyanikā, the Sanskrit form of whose name is Nāganikā, belonged to a Nāga family. Śisuka the first Andhra king was also connected with the Nāgas.

191 *Peculiarities of the Joghalembhī Hoard*. Gautamīputra

LIII Yajñaśrī  
and Restruck Coins  
of Nahapāna

Śrī Yajña Śātakarni like his illustrious ancestor and namesake Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni, the sixth Andhra king, was a powerful monarch. The variety of his coins and

the extent of their provenance clearly show his superior position among the Andhra kings. For some reason which cannot be definitely specified restruck and double-struck Andhra coins began to make their appearance at the time of the Vīlīyākuras downwards. The restruck coins of Nahapāna, however, are

generally ascribed to Gautamīputra Śātakarni, the sixth king, wrongly supposed to be the 23rd king. I have an impression that these coins, all of which, without any exception, are to be traced to a single hoard, viz., the Joghaltembhi find, were restruck at the time of Yajñaśrī. About 300 years had elapsed at the time of Yajñaśrī since Nahapāna issued his coins. Somebody found the hoard and had a portion of them restruck in order to be able to use the coins. That there was no original coin of Gautamīputra or of anybody else in the hoard is a strong proof of the fact that the restamping was done after the hoard had been found. Nahapāna's coins seem to have been restruck with different dies. It is likely that in order to avoid the confiscation of any part of the hoard by the State under the treasure trove act of the times (29) the discoverer was getting the coins restamped in small quantities in different places representing them to be his heirloom. This must have been a slow process. The discoverer died leaving the hoard hidden, and a part of it unstamped. Scott writes 'The great variety of dies used in making the counter-impression is as noticeable as the variety in the case of Nahapāna's coins to which I have drawn attention. The work was evidently done by many different workmen, of very different abilities, and probably at many different places' (The Nasik-Joghaltembhi-Hoard of Nahapāna's Coins, Rev H R Scott, jbbas XXII p 241). Rapson writes 'The latter class, (restruck coins of Nahapāna) which comprises more than two-thirds of the total number of coins found, has struck over the ordinary types of Nahapāna, the Andhra types, obv "Caitya with inscr" rev "Ujjain symbol", which appear together on lead coins of Pulumāvi, Śiva Śrī, Canda Śāti and Śrī Yajña, but which had not previously been found associated on coins of Gautamīputra Śātakarni. So far as is known at present, these types were not used for any independent silver coinage, but were simply employed for the purpose of re-issuing the existing currency' (Cca p lxxxix).

192 *Coins bearing the Legend 'Gautamīputra Śātakarni'*  
The facts noted above will be best explained by the supposition that Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni did not issue any coin having ascended the imperial throne without a probationary period of provincial governorship. On the other hand, Yajñaśrī had a long period of provincial reign, viz., 18 years or more, and it is he that is responsible for all the coins bearing the legend 'Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni'. The conchshell symbol, if it has been correctly deciphered, that exists in the coin ascribed to Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni (Cca p 17), is peculiar to Gautamīputra Yajñaśrī Śātakarni, this is another argument in favour of the assertion that Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni, the sixth king, the so-called conqueror of Nahapāna, did not mint any coin at all.



## 13 SOME TENTATIVE IDENTIFICATIONS

193 *Difficulties in identifying the 'Pulumāvi' of the Coins*

LIV Kṛṣṇa and  
Vāsisthīputra Śiva-  
śrī Pulumāvi

The inscriptions and coins of other Andhra kings or of their satraps need not be considered for the present as they do not throw any fresh light on Andhra chronology, neither do they help us in establishing the identities of puranic Andhra kings. I should like to point out that king Kṛṣṇa of the Nasik inscription, Luders No 1144, and of the coin (Cea p 48) may not after all be the second puranic king of the same name. There is another Kṛṣṇa, apparently also of the Śātavāhana sub-clan, in the puranic list, viz., No 16 who has been called Nemikṛṣṇa (Vap) or Goraksakṛṣṇa (Vip-w). He may very well be the person mentioned in the inscription and the coin. Martin has described two coins of Pulumāvi with the legends 'Śivaśrī Pulumaviśa' and 'Vāsisthīputra Śivaśrī Pulumaviśa' respectively (Numismatic Supplement for 1934, Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, No 318, p 61 N). These coins raise grave doubts about the hitherto accepted identifications of the several Pulumāvis appearing in the puranic list, in view of this find, ascribing a particular coin to a particular Pulumāvi becomes a very difficult if not an impossible task. There is nothing to show in the coins themselves whether all of them that have the legend Pulumāvi belong to the same king or to different kings bearing the same name. The name, found in Martin's coins, 'Śivaśrī' suggests the later Andhras. According to the Ānandāśram Matsya the name of the 25th king is Śivaśrī Pulomā, Viṣṇu calls him Śātakarni Śivaśrī, the Radcliffe manuscript calls him simply Śivaśrī. Very likely the coins with the legend 'Vāsisthīputra Śivaśrī Pulumavi' are to be ascribed to this king. K N Dikshit has lately described a copper coin with the legend 'Raño Sivasiris Āpilakasa' (Jrasb Numis Supplement XLVII pp 93, 94 N). This coin may be ascribed to the eighth king tentatively.

194 *Filling up the gaps* I have already established four

LV Some Tentative  
Identifications

points of contact between the puranic and the inscriptional series of Andhra kings on the basis of independent dates on both sides and of similarity of names. An attempt may now be made to indicate the inscriptional and coin names of some of the remaining 26 kings. The identifications of these kings are bound to be tentative as no dates other than puranic are available. Neither is there any other indication that might definitely fix their individual positions in the puranic list. A reference to Table XII will show the proposed identifications.

TABLE XII IDENTIFICATIONS

No	Date	Purāṇa	Inscription and Coin	REMARKS
1	21 b C	Śisuka	Simuka	Contemporary of Vikramāditya 1s 1113 Identification certain (1s 346, 1144, Cca p 48 ?) See king No 16
2	2 a C	Kiṣṇa	Kaṇha	
3	20	Śrī Mallakarna		
4	38	Pārnotsanga	Gautamīputra Śrī Sūta-karna Vāsīsthīputra Śrī Puṣṭa māvi Sivaśrī Āpilaka	Puranic variants—Śrī Kantakarna, Śrī Sātākarna
5	56	Skandhastambha		
6	71	Śrī Sātākarna		
7	130	Lambodara		1s 1123, 1125, 1126 (Cca pp 17, 68 ?) Identification certain Son of No 6, 1s 1123 (Cca pp 20-24 ?) Identification certain (Jrasb Numus Suplmt XLVII p 93 N ?)
8	148	Āpilaka		
9	160	Meghasvātī		
10	178	Svātī		Puranic variant—Patumān See kings Nos 7, 24, 25, 30
11	196	Skandhasvātī		
12	203	Mrigendra Svātīkarna		
13	206	Kuntala Svātīkarna		Puranic variants—Nemikṣṇa, Vikṣṇa See king No 2
14	214	Svātīkarna		
15	215	Pulomūvit		
16	251	Goraksukṣṇa		Associated with Hāla—Saptaśataka
17	276	Hāla		
18	281	Pattalaka		
19	286	Purindrasena		Śūtavahāna rule ends Mtp a 273 16 First of the Andhrabhṛtyas (Cca p 5 ?)
20	307	Sundara Svātīkarna	Vāsīsthīputra Vihvāya kura	

21	312	Cakora Svātīkarna	Mātharīputra Śivalakura	Cea p 7 Restruck coins of previous king
22	312	Śivasvātī	Mātharīputra Svāmī Sakasena	Puranic variant—Śivasvāmī (ls 1001, 1002?)
23	340	Gautamīputra	Gautamīputra Vilvāyākura	Cea p 13 Restruck coins of kings Nos 20, 21
24	361	Pulomā		See kings Nos 7, 15, 25, 30
25	380	Śivaśrī Śāntīkarna	Vāsiṣṭhīputra Sivaśrī Pulumāvi	Mtp a 273 13 Martin's coins
26	396	Śivaskandha Śātakarni	Śrī Sivamaka Śāta	(ls 1279?) The last of the Andhra bhṛtyas Mtp a 273 17, 18
27	403	Yajñaśrī Śātakarni	Gautamīputra Śrī Yajña Śātekarni	ls 987, 1024, 1146, 1340 Cea pp 34-45 Vip w IV pp 201-205 Identification certain
28	412	Vijaya		
29	418	Candraśrī Śātakarni	Vāsiṣṭhīputra Śrī Candrasati	ls 1341, R., p 30 Ehn p 316 n Puranic variant—Vadaśrī ls 1112 Identification certain
30	428 435	Pulomā		See kings Nos 7, 15, 24 and 25 End of the Andhra Empire

## 14 RECONSTRUCTED ANDHRA CHRONOLOGY

195 *Chronological History* The chronological history of the Andhra period may now be summarized  
 LVI Recon  
 structured Andhra  
 Chronology For further details and for information of the social and the economic condition of the people during this period reference may be made to the writings of other workers on Andhra history

196 *Reconstructed Andhra History* About 66 b C Devabhūti, the last of the Śunga kings, was murdered by his brāhmana minister Vasudeva who usurped the throne. Vasudeva belonged to the Kanva family. The Kanvas traced their descent to the ancient Puru dynasty. The Kanvas were originally kṣatriyas and became brāhmanas later on (Vip-b IV 19 2, 10). In spite of their kṣatriya blood the Kanvas were weak rulers. Towards the end of Vasudeva's reign a provincial governor, with his capital at Ujjayini, Vikramāditya by name, broke free from the Kanva yoke, annexed adjoining territories and declared himself an independent king. In 21 b C another provincial governor of the Kanvas, named Śisuka, killed the last Kanva king Suśarman and captured the imperial throne. The short reign of the Kanva dynasty came to an end in 21 b C. Śisuka was an Andhra and a śūdra by caste. His capital was at Pratiṣṭhāna, the modern Paithan. Very likely he was a Nāga originally belonging to Andhradeśa. He came of a clan called Śātakarni, and the sub-clan or family to which he belonged was named Śātavāhana or Śālvāhana. The Śātakarnis followed the matriarchal social system prevalent in the Deccan. Śisuka's ancestors were hereditary provincial governors from the time of the Śungas. The long association of the Śātakarnis with the people of the west was responsible for their giving up the matriarchal form of inheritance although in other matters they observed matriarchal custom. Amongst the Śātakarnis the succession often devolved upon brothers in preference to the son. This compromise between the patriarchal and the matriarchal system of inheritance was probably one of the most important factors that led to the appointment of princes of the royal blood as provincial governors and the appointment of dowager queens as regents when the princes happened to be minors.

197 *Bid for Sovereignty* When Śisuka ascended the imperial throne in 21 b C he found a formidable rival in Vikramāditya. A bid for sovereignty ensued between these two powerful and ambitious princes. Vikramāditya was overthrown in about 18 b C after a great fight and had to acknowledge the suzerainty of Śisuka during the rest of his life. It appears that the province of Mālava, conquered at so much cost, was lost to the Andhras some time after the death of Śisuka probably as a result of the rise of the Kūṣāna power. After Śisuka's death in 2 a C his brother Kṛṣṇa became the king. Nothing definite is

known about the princes who came after Śīśuka till we come to the sixth king who was called Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni

198 *The Great Gautamīputra* Gautamīputra was a great king. He ascended the throne in 74 A.C. He succeeded in reconquering all his ancestral dominions, in subjugating the Śakas, Yavanas and Palhavas that had formed small independent principalities, and in conquering other kṣatriya kings of his time who had defied Andhra supremacy. His greatest military exploit was the conquest of the Khakharātas, a family of powerful Śaka emperors. Gautamīputra re-established the prestige of his family. He was generous towards his defeated enemies, and he appointed them as provincial governors under him. He had several Śaka governors as satraps. He appointed Caṣṭana the Śaka to the governorship of the reconquered province of Mālava and Bhūmaka, another Śaka, to the rulership of Mahārāṣṭra. Gautamīputra came to be known as the friend of the Śakas and was called Śakāditya. He founded an era to commemorate his victories in 78 A.D. The era was known as Śakāvda and also as the Śālvāhana era.

199 *Provincial Governors under Gautamīputra* All provincial governors and satraps under Gautamīputra, unless they belonged to the royal family, had to record State events in terms of his era. The provincial governors, however, were allowed great latitude in all matters. They waged wars on their own account, and minted coins. The imperial authority did not interfere in these affairs. It remained satisfied so long as it regularly got its dues. This arrangement lent strength to the imperial Andhras and was perhaps one of the reasons that contributed to the long reign of the Andhra dynasty.

200 *The Andhras and the Kuṣānas* The relation of the Andhras to the Kuṣānas is not at all clear. That two powerful empires should exist side by side without coming into conflict with each other is rather strange. It is stranger still that no record of their mutual relationship should be left in coins and inscriptions. If it is proved that the Kuṣānas used the Śaka era then that would be a strong presumptive evidence in favour of the assumption that the Kuṣānas were feudatories to the Andhras for a part of their empire at least. Gautamīputra's mother records in an inscription that her son conquered the Khakharātas who, as there are reasons to believe, were a very powerful dynasty of kings. If the use of the Śaka era by the Kuṣānas is substantiated it would be possible to identify either Kadphises I or Kadphises II, whoever of these two died in 78 A.D., with the Khakharāta mentioned in the inscription. It is interesting to note in this connection that although Kanīṣka has been described as 'rājātrīrāja' in inscriptions in pursuance of his family custom, he does not use this title in any of his coins. No separate Indian name for the Kuṣānas exists, they were grouped together with the Śakas, a name familiar to Indians for

many centuries past, having come through the same route, one in the wake of the other. According to Laufer, the Yue-chi, the people to which the Kuṣānas belonged, were Scythic Iranians (Ehṛ p 264 n). The Kuṣānas could thus be known as Śakas. The Kuṣāna kings appear to have been called Śakarāts or Śaka emperors, Khakharāta is probably the Prākṛita form of Śakarāt. All this however is mere conjecture at the present state of our knowledge, and we must wait for further information before any definite opinion can be pronounced in this matter.

201 *The End of the Andhra Empire* The Śātavāhana sub-clan enjoyed uninterrupted reign from 21 b C to 307 a C when the Andhrabhṛtyas, who were provincial governors under the Śātavāhanas and very probably related to them, came into power. The old Andhra stock of Śātavāhanas occupied the imperial throne again in 403 a C when Yajñaśrī became king. Yajñaśrī was a great prince and he tried to revive the glory of the Śātavāhana family. He, it seems, was a supporter of Hindu religion as distinguished from Buddhism and Jainism. The Hindu revival that attained its acme about the time of the Guptas started in Andhra times. The Andhra empire which began in 21 b C came to an end in 435 a C having lasted for four centuries and a half. Minor Andhra princes continued to reign in isolated provinces either as independent kings or as provincial governors under other kings for a long time afterwards. If the date of the Gupta era has been correctly fixed the great Andhra empire must have shown signs of disintegration with the rise of the Guptas from about 320 A D.

202 *Andhras as Patrons of Learning* The Andhras appear to have been enlightened rulers under whom arts and commerce flourished. They were patrons of learning. The names of two Andhra kings, viz., Śiśuka and Hāla, are connected with literary works. The science of astronomy received great encouragement at Vikramāditya's court and it was at his time that Ujjayini became the zero point from which longitudes are calculated in Indian astronomical works. This was a great achievement of Vikramāditya. Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni, who founded the Śaka era, must have followed the scientific traditions of Vikramāditya's times. The use of the Śaka era in later astronomical works shows that the Andhras had a share also in the revival of Hindu astronomy that began in the first century before the Christian era.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the preparation of this paper I have received great help from Mr. Bahadur Singh Singh who very kindly gave me access to his splendid collection of coins of the Andhra period and also lent me various literature on the subject. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Narendra Nath Law for allowing me to use his library.

for reference to the source books of Andhra history. My thanks are due to Pundit Isvar Chandra Sastri Pancatirtha, Pundit Durgamohan Bhattacharyya, Kavya-Sankhya-Puranatirtha, M A, Mr Isan Chandra Ray, B A, and Pundit Sukhlalji of Benares for elucidating the difficult puranic ślokas referred to in this article. I am indebted to Mr Sailendrakrishna Law, M A, for certain valuable suggestions.

## APPENDIX

## BALAŚRI INSCRIPTION. PANDU-LENA CAVES NASIK

Lüders No 1123 Transliteration according to  
BLI bg XVI 1883 pp 550, 551 Inscription 2  
[For translation see (150)]

- Line 1 siddha[m]raño vāsiṭhūputasa siripulūmāyisa savachare  
ekunavise 19 gīmḥūna pakhe bitīye 2 divase terase  
13 rājaraño gotamīputasa himavatmeru—
- Line 2 ma[n]darapavatasamsārasa asikasusakamulakasura-  
ṭhakukurāparātaanupavidabha ākarāba[n]tīrājasa  
vi[ñ]jha[r]chavatapāricāta sahyakanhagīma[ñ]-  
casirīṭanamalayamaḥi[n]da—
- Line 3 seṭagīricakorapavatapatīsa savarājālokama[n]dala-  
patīgahitasāsanaśa divasakarakaravibodhitakamala-  
bīmala sadisabadanasa tīsamudatoyapītavāhanasa  
paṭipunacadama[n]dalasasīrika—
- Line 4 piyadasanasa varavāranavikamacāruvikamasa bhuja-  
gapatībhoga pīnabaṭavīpuladīghasu[n]darabhujasa  
abhyodakadānakūlīnanībhayakarasa avīpanamātu-  
sususāka[ra]sa suvībhatatīvagadesakāśa—
- Line 5 porajanavīsesasamasukhadukhasa khatīyadapamā-  
namadanasa sakayavanapālhanīsūdanasā dha-  
mopajitakaravīnyogakarasa kīṭāparādhepī satujane  
apānahī[m]sārucīsa dījāvarakuṭubavīvadha—
- Line 6 nasa khakharātava[m]sanīravasesakarasa sātavāhana-  
kulayasapatīṭhāpanakarasa savama[n]dalābhīvā-  
dītaca[r]anasa vīnīvatītacātuvanasa[n]karasa aneka-  
samarāvajītasatusaghasa aparājītavījayapatāka-  
sa[saj]tūjanadu padhasanīya—
- Line 7 puravarasa kulapurīsapara[m]parāgatavīpularāja-  
sadasa āgamānam nīlayasa sapurīsāna asayasa sīriya  
adhiṭhānasa upacārānam pabhavasa eka[n]kusasa  
ekadhanudharasa ekasūrasa ekabāmbhanasa rāma—
- Line 8 kesavājunabhīmasenatulaparakamasa chanayanusava-  
samājakārakasa nābhāganahusajanamejayasakara-  
yayātīrāmā[m]barīsasamatejasa aparīmitamakha-  
yamacītamabhutam pavanagarudasīdhayakha-  
rakhasavījādhārabhūtaga[n]dhavacārana—
- Line 9 ca[n]dadivākaranakhatagahavīcināsamarasīrasī jītarī-  
pusa[n]ghasanagavarakhadhāgaganatalamabhīvīgā-  
dhasa kulavīpulasīrikarasa sīsītakanīsa mātuya  
mahādevīya gotamīya balasīriya sacavacanādāna-  
khamāhīmsānīratāya tapadamānīya—
- Line 10 mopavāsataparāya rajarīsīvadhusadamakhīlamanu-  
vidhīyamānāyakārīta[m] deyadham  
sīkharasadīse tīranhupavatasīkhare vīmānavarāni-



- visesamalahdhikaleṇa eta ca leṇa mahādevī mahā-  
rājāmūtā mahārājaputāmāhī dadāti mikāyasa  
bhadāvanīyāna bhikṣusaṅghasa  
Line 11 etasa ca leṇasa citanannimuta[m] mahādevīya ayakāya  
sevākāmo pivakāmo ca nā [dakṣinā] pathe-  
saio pitṛpatiyo dhamasetusa dadāti gama[m]  
tīrāṇhupavatasā aparadakhinapase piśājipadakam  
savajātabhogaṇirāṭhi

GĀUTAMĪPUTRA ŚĀTAKARNĪ AND JĪVASŪTĀ INSCRIPTIONS  
PANDU LENA CAVERES NASIK

Lüders No 1125 and No 1126 Transliteration  
according to BLI bg XVI 1883 pp 558-560

Inscriptions No 4 and No 5

[For translation see (169, 170, 171)]

*Gautamīputra Śātakarnī Inscription*

- Line 1 siddham senāve vejavantiye vijayakhadhāvārā govo-  
dhanasa benākatakāsvāmī gotamiputo srisadakānī  
Line 2 ānapayati govodhane amaca[m] vinūhupāhtam gāme  
aparakakhadīyam jaṇi khetam ajakālakīyam usa-  
bhadūtena bhūtam mīvatana  
Line 3 satām be 200 eta amhakota[m] mīvatanasatānī be 200  
imesa pavajitāna tekīrasīna vitarāma etasa casa  
katasa parihāra[m]  
Line 4 vitarāma apāvesa anomasa alonakhādaka arāṭhasa-  
vinayika savajātāparihārīka ca etalī na parihāreḥī  
pariharalī  
Line 5 ete casa ketāpariharecca etha mībadhī līlī suvīyena  
ānatam amacena sīvagutena chato mahāsāmīyehī  
uparakhītā  
Line 6 datā paṭikā savachare 18 vasūpakhe 2 divase 1 tāpa-  
sa(sā)na kaṭā

*Jivasūtā Inscription* "There is a holy cross or svastika mark at  
the end of inscription 4 (Gautamīputra inscription given  
above) in the middle of line six. Inscription 5 (Jivasūtā  
inscription as given below) begins just after with 'siddham' "  
(BLI bg Vol XVI 1883 p 558)

- Line 6 (of previous inscription continued)  
Siddha govadhane amacasa  
sa(sā)makasadeyo rājanīto  
Line 7 raṇo gotamiputasa satakāṇisa mahādevīya ca jīva-  
sūtāya rājāmūtuya vacanena govadhana [ama]co  
sāmako ārogavatavo tato eva(m)  
Line 8 vatavo etha amheḥī pavate tīrāṇhumhī amhadhama-  
dāne leṇe pativasatāna pavajitāna bhikṣūna gāme  
kakhadīsu puvakhetam data(m) ta ca khetā

- Line 9 va(vi)kasate so ca gāmo na vasati evam sati yadāni  
etha uagarasīme rājakaṁ khetam amhasatakam  
tato etasa pavaṇitāna bhikhūna teranhukānam  
dadama
- Line 10 khetasa nivatana satam 100 tasa ca khetasa pariḥāram  
vitarāma apāvesa anomasa alonakhādaka arathr-  
savinayika savaṇātapaṛihārika ca
- Line 11 otehi na pariḥārehi pariḥarathā eta casa khetapari-  
hāra[m] ca etha nibadhāpetha subiyena ānata  
paṭihārakhiya[m] lāja[nī]yamatā lekhe savachare 24
- Line 12 vāsāna pakhe 4 divase paṁcane 5 pu[va]ṇitā kaṭā  
nibadhā nibadho savachare 24 gimhānapakhe 2  
divase 10

### PURANIC ŚLOKAS RELATING TO ANDHRA SUB-CLANS

Vap-a 99 357, 358 and 359

pulovāpi samāh sapta anyeṣām\* ca bhaviṣyati  
ityete vai nṛpāstīrṇśadandhrā bhokṣyanti ye mahim  
samāh śatāncatvāri pañca ṣadvai tathaiḥ ca  
andhrānām samsthitāḥ pañca teṣām vamsāḥ samāh punaḥ  
saptaiva tu bhaviṣyanti daśābhīrāstatō nṛpāḥ  
sapta gardabhīnaścāpi tatoṭha daśa vai śakāḥ

#### *Prose order or anvaya*

pulovā api sapta samāh [bhaviṣyati]/ anyeṣām\* [andhrā-  
nām] ca [rājyam] bhaviṣyati/ iti ete vai ye trīṁśat andhrāḥ  
nṛpāḥ catvāri śatāni tathā vai pañca ṣaṭ samāḥ eva ca mahim  
bhokṣyanti/ teṣām pañca vamsāḥ punaḥ samāh (samakālīnāḥ)  
samsthitāḥ/ [mūlavamśāt anyasmin vamsō] andhrāḥ sapta  
eva bhaviṣyanti tataḥ daśa ābhīrāḥ nṛpāḥ [bhaviṣyanti]/  
gardabhīnaḥ ca api sapta atha tataḥ śakāḥ daśa vai/ (continued  
in the next śloka)

#### *Translation*

Pulovā [will reign] for seven years There will be  
[kingdom] for other [Andhras] also/ Thus for these thirty  
Andhra kings that will enjoy this earth for four hundred years  
and also five six years in addition/ there will be five families  
(vamsāḥ), further they will reign contemporaneously/ [In  
the dynasty other than the main one] there will be seven  
Andhras and also ten Ābhīra kings/ Also seven Gardabhīna  
and then ten Śakas (continued in the next śloka)

#### *Translation for the variant reading 'anyasteṣām'*

And Pulovā [will reign] for seven years Another [dy-  
nasty besides the main one] of those [Andhras] will reign

\* Variant reading—anyasteṣām

## Mtp-a 273 16, 17 and 18

pulomā sapta varṣāni anyasteṣāṃ bhaviṣyati  
 ekonaviṃśatirhyete āndhrā bhokṣyanti vai mahān  
 teṣāṃ varṣaśatāni syuṣcatvān gaṣṭhira va ca  
 āndhrānām samsthitā rājye teṣāṃ bhṛtyānvaye nṛpāḥ  
 saptaivāndhrā bhaviṣyanti daśābhīrā-tathā nṛpāḥ  
 sapta gardabhilāścāpi śakāścāśtādaśaiva ca

Mtp-a 273 36, 37, 38 and 39

mahāpadmābhīṣekāttu yāvajjanma parīkṣitah  
 evam varṣasahasram tu jñeyam pañcāśaduttaram  
 paulomastu tathāndhrāstu mahāpadmāntare punah  
 anantaram śatānyaṣṭau śattrimśattu samāstathā  
 tāvat kālāntaram bhāvyamāndhrāntādāparīkṣitah  
 bhaviṣye te prasamkhyātāḥ purāṇajñāḥ śrutarṣibhiḥ  
 saptarṣayastadā prāmsupradiptenāgninā samāh  
 saptavimśatī bhāvyānāmāndhrānām tu yadā punah

For translation of śloka 36, 37 and 38 see (120), and for  
 translation of śloka 39 see (104)

Vip-w p 230 or Vip-b IV 24-32

yāvatparīkṣito janma yāvannandābhīṣecanam  
 etadvarṣasahasram tu jñeyam pañcadaśottaram

For translation of this śloka see (120)

## INDEX OF SUBJECTS

*(Index numbers refer to paragraphs and not to pages)*

## A

Ābhiras 147, 183

Additions and omissions in puranic records 95

Adhisāmakṛṣṇa, Adhī-śmakṛṣṇa, Adhisomakṛṣṇa or Aśīmakṛṣṇa, 89

Agnimitra 12

Āitareya Brāhmaṇa, 7, 9

- Chronology, Andhra, see Andhra chronology error in the present-day version of, 82, 83 foundation of, 19(2), 19(6a), 21, 61, 133-149 insecure foundation of, 81 need of revision of, 1, 82, 83, 100, 195-201
- Chronology, puranic, 99, 100, 195-201 comparison with hypothetical example, 82 concord in, 108 external support of, 132-149
- Coins, Andhra, 18, 193 double struck, 28 Joghalthembhi, 191, 192, see restruck coins with legend Gautamīputra Śātakarni, 192 with legend Pulumāvi, 193 minted by provincial rulers, 26, 199 minted by small independent states, 44 minted by paramount power, 26, 149 restruck, 4, 27-29, 191, 192
- Contemporaneity of, Andhras, Mauryas, Sungas and Kanvas, 3 Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni, Vāsīṣṭhīputra Puṣumāvi, Nahapāna, Caṣṭana, Rudradāman, and Ptolemy, 4 Kalki, Viśākhayūpa, Brhadratha and Śuddhodana, 125 Śisuka and Vikramāditya, 137-141
- Correlation of data, see data
- Cutu, an Andhra sub clan, 183
- Cuṭukaḍānanda, 5, 57, 143

## D

- Dahrasena, 148, 173, 183
- Dark period, 5, 73, 80, 82, 149
- Data, correlation of inscriptional and puranic, 15, 39, 62, 67, 132 faulty correlation of, 67, 74 in hypothetical example, 71, 77 two groups of, 62
- Dates, of Andhra kings, 83, 100 of Andhra reign 20 of Candrasrī, 136, 145 of Gautamīputra, 19(6a), 132, 133, 133(1) of Guptas, 149 identity of, 65, 77 key date of Gautamīputra's times, 178 kings with known, 79 of Malabharatan war, 106 puranic, 78, 83, 100 of Sisuka, 137-144 of Yājñaśrī, 134, 135, 145
- Devabhūti, 196
- Dikshit, K N, 193
- Dīrghatamas, 8
- Dvātrīṃśat Puttalikā, 137, 140
- Dynastic, lists of Andhras, 90-92 lists in the Bible, 68 lists, puranic, 100 lists of the Purus, 67 reign, total as a guide, 96 averages of reigning periods in different, 116

## E

- End of the Andhras, 5, 201
- English puranas, 68
- Epigraphic estimate, Bühler's, 60 Chanda's, 54(2) Indrajī's, 55 Jayaswal's, 54(1) Rapson's, 56, 57
- Epigraphic evidence, 2, 3 caution in admitting, 26, 51, 61 error in, fallacies in, futility of, risks of admitting, 51-61
- Epigraphy, different readings, 58 Nanaghat inscriptions and, 3, 19(5), 179 persistence of old forms, 59 sporadic forms of letters, 189
- Era, Kālī, 122-131 Muriya, 2, 58 Nanda, 120-131, see Nanda era puranic, 120 reference, 39, 78 Śāka, 42, 47-49, 122, 161, 166, see Śāka era Vikrama, 122, 142 Yudhiṣṭhira, 130
- Error, suspicion of, in accepted Andhra chronology, 83 vagueness in indicating margin of, in epigraphic estimates, 53
- Evidence, epigraphic, see epigraphic evidence inscriptional and numismatic, 3 meaning of, 17 literary, 19(1), 134-137, 145
- Example, hypothetical, 67-73, 82

## F

- Fergusson, 45
- Fleet, J F, 166

## G

Gaps in identification, 194

Gautamīputra, 1 19(6), 19(6a), 132 133(1), 150-155, 163-165, 169, 172, 174, 176, 178, 198, 199 ancestors of, 155 conciliatory policy of, 165 enemies of 154 date of, 19(6a), 132 gifts of, 174 the Great, 198 identification with Śrī Śātakarni the 6th king, 133, 133(1) identification with the 23rd king, 1, 21, 61, 80 inscription of, 169 and Kshakharātas, 162, 163 overlord of Pulumāvi, 40, 50, 151 overlord of Usabhadāta, 176 popularity of, 164 prestige of the dynasty of, 163 provincial rulership of, 172 Pulumāvi and, 4, 19(6d), 40, 132, 133, 151 queen of, 171 and Rudradāman, 50 and Śakas, 154, 160-164 territory of, 150 152 times of, 153, 178 Usabhadāta and, 19(6), 169, 176 Viśvāvakura, 5, 27 and western satraps, 165, 167, 168, 198 Yajñasrī, 188

Generation interval, 109, 112, 117 average, 114 Bengali, 111, 112 British, 113 puranic, 103, 112 variation of, 115

Gotra names, and matriarchy, 32 and patriarchy, 33

Greek accounts, 85

Guptas, 119, 201

## H

Hakusiri, 43, 180, 181 meaning of name, 186, 187, see Śaktisrī

Hall, Fitzedward, 90, 91, 100

Hārīti-putra, 33

Harold and Rāmacandra, 84

Hātigumpha inscription, see inscription

Hindu religious revival, 185

Hol-lo mien and Pulomā, 134, 135

## I

Identifications, accepted, 80 canons of, 63 false, 38 tentative, 194

Identity of dates and places, 65, 77 four fold basis of, 63 of incidents, 64, 76 of names, 38, 63, 75

Ikṣvāku, 157

Indraji, Bhagvānlāl, 55, 58, 81, 171, 189

Inscriptions, Andhra, 18 Balaśrī, 19(6c), 150, 177 Bhilsa Tope, 56 Gurnar, 19(6b), of Gautamīputra, 169-176 Hātigumpha, 2, 19(2), 54(1), 54(2), 58, 61, 63, 81 hypothetical, 69 Jivasūtā, 170-172 Kārik, 4, 19(6) Nanaghat, 2, 19(5), 179-181, 185-190 Nasik, 4, 19(6), 19(6c), 55 and puranic account, 15, 66

Inscriptional, dates for Gautamīputra and Pulumāvi, 132 evidence is interpretation, 17 and numismatic records, 18 and puranic data, correlation of, 62 and puranic regnal years, 40

Intervals, see Time Intervals

Īśvardatta, 148

Īśvarsena, 148

## J

Jayaswāl, K P, 54(1), 58, 154

Jivasūtā, inscription, see inscription name of Gautamīputra's queen, 171

Joghaltembhu hoard, 191, see coins, restruck

## K

Kadphises, founder of Śaka era, 47

Kālakāchārya, 166

Kali, era, 122-131 yuga, see yuga

- Kālidāsa and the Andhras, 10  
 Kalinga, 8, 10  
 Kalingas and Andhras, 2, 19(3)  
 Kalki, 124, 125  
 Kalpa, see Yuga  
 Kaṁṣka, 45, 47-49, 154  
 Kanvas, 143, 196  
 Karle inscriptions, see inscriptions  
 Kennedy, Vans, 118  
 Khakharāta, see inscriptions, Balaśrī and Śakarāt, 162, 200  
 Khāravēla, and Śātakarni, see Hatigumpha  
 Kings, with different names, 89 with known dates, 79 with the same name, 35 sixth and seventh, 133 twenty third and twenty fourth, 19(6d), 182  
 Kingdom, ancient Andhra, 9  
 Kṛṣṇa, 3, 5, 19(5), 34, 63, 86, 193  
 Kṛta yuga, see Yuga  
 Kṣemarāja, 2  
 Ksatrapas and mahākṣatrapas, 22, 23, 45 of Indian descent, 23 and paramount power, 22, 45  
 Kuṣāṇas, and Andhras, 197, 200 overlord of western satraps, 45, 46 and Śakas, 200 and the origin of the Śaka era, see Śaka era

## L

- Lambodara, 36 see Puṣumāvi  
 Laufer, 200  
 Literary evidence 19(1), 134-137, 145  
 Lüders, 43, 50, 58, 148, 150, 158, 169, 170, 173-177, 179, 193

## M

- Madanamañjari Nāṭaka, 183  
 Māgadhas, 97  
 Maghā, beginning of kali, 106  
 Mahābhārata, 7, 10, 67, 106  
 Mahabharatan war, 9, 10, 106  
 Mahākṣatrapa, see kṣatrapa  
 Mahalanobis, P C, 111  
 Mahānandi, 117  
 Mahārājā, 22, 42, 44, 148  
 Mānavaka, 138, 140  
 Māndhātṛ, 8  
 Manusamhita, 29  
 Mātharīputra, 5, 27, 33  
 Matriarchy, 32  
 Mauryas, and Andhras, 3 puranic account of, 12, 13  
 Mitākṣarā, 29  
 Modern version of Andhra history, 14  
 Monier Williams, Monier, 160, 161  
 Mudānanda, 5, 143  
 Munika, 12  
 Muriya, 2, 58

## N

- Nāgas, 139, 143  
 Nāganikā or Nāyanikā, queen, see queen  
 Nahapāna, 4, 19(6), 27, 45, 60, 159, 168, 191  
 Names, Andhra clan, 30, 31 Andhra sub clan, 183 coin and inscriptional, 194 different, 89 gotra, 32-34 identification by, 34-36, 38 identity of, 63, 65 nicknames, 36, 37, 164 personal, 34, 133(1),



- Prākṛit and Sanskrit, 89, 158 of Śakas etc, 158 same, 35 uncertainty of, 34  
 Nanaghat inscriptions, see inscriptions  
 Nanda, coronation date of, 130, 131 incarnation of Kālī, 130 puranic conception of social order and, 129 as regent, 102  
 Nanda era, 100, 121, 122 extension of, 126 fate of, 122 transformation of, 122, 123, see era  
 Nandivardhana, 117  
 Nasik inscriptions, see inscriptions

## O

- Opinion, difference of, in epigraphic estimate, 54-60  
 Oudra, 8

## P

- Pāndya, 10  
 Paramount power, and kṣatrapas, 22  
 Parīkṣit, 35, 106, 107, 120, 126 Nanda, Andhra time interval, 107, 120  
 Patriarchy, 33  
 People, Andhra, 7  
 Pratiṣṭhānagara, 138, 140, 196  
 Prince of Wales, 165  
 Privileges, renewal of, 175  
 Provincial rulers, 24 appointments of Bhūmaka, Caṣṭana and Puṣumāvī as, 168 coins minted by, 26 four classes of, 24 Gautamīputra and, 199 regnal years of, 41 royal, 25, 40, 43  
 Ptolemy and the Andhras, 4, 19(7)  
 Pulindas, 9  
 Puṣumāvī, coins bearing legend, 193 date of, 132 and Gautamīputra, 4, 19(6c), 40, 132, 133, 151, 168 identification with Lambodara the 7th king, 133, 133(1) identification with the 24th king, 4, 21, 61, 80 marriage of, 154, 168 personal name, 34 regnal years of, 177 and Rudradāman, 19(6b), 50 Vāsisthiputra, 4  
 Pundra, 8  
 Purānapraveśa, 102, 105, 107, 127  
 Purānas, 118 Bhāgavat, 8, 90 Bhaviṣya, 119 Brahmāṇḍa, 90 Kalkī, 124, 125 Matsya, 90, 91, 96, 98, 99, 104, 120, 130, 133, 189, 193 Skanda, 98 Vāyu, 90, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 104, 120, 124, 130 Viṣṇu, 90, 96, 98, 99, 106, 120, 126, 127, 133, 134, 193  
 Purānas, accepted partly, 2, 3, 16 amending, 16, 66, 67, 77, 88, 95, 96 attitude of scholars towards, 16, 66, 84-87 Bühler on, 86 different readings of, 67, 98 discrepancies in, 93, 96, 118 English hypothetical, 68 preservation of, 118, 119 redactors of, 119 unanimity in, 92, 118 urtext of, 88, 98  
 Purānakāras, 97, 98, 119  
 Puranic, account of Andhras, Kanvas, Mauryas and Sungas, 12, 13 account, onus of proof, 84 account, hypothetical, 69 account and inscriptions, 15 chronology, see chronology data, inscriptional and, correlation of, 15, 62, see data disagreement between, 66 dates, 78, 99, 108 dates, concord in, 108 era, see era regnal years, determination of, 93-96 regnal years and inscriptional, 40, 41, 78, 133(1) time records, supposed defects in, 14, 39, 41, 67, 78 tradition, 153  
 Purus, different dynastic lists of, 67  
 Puṣyamitra, 12

## Q

- Queen, Balaśrī, 150, 177 Jīvasūtā, 170, 171 Nāganikā or Nāyanikā, 179-181, 185-188 Sudeṣṇa, 8

## R

- Radcliffe, 90, 91, 100, 193  
 Raghuvamśam, 10  
 Rājā, 22, 42  
 Rāmacandra and Harold, 84  
 Rapson, E J, 6, 16, 19(2), 19(3), 19(5), 19(6a), 23, 26, 45, 46, 56, 57, 143, 146, 147, 154, 167, 171, 187, 191  
 Regnal period, average, 109-111 average of regnal period, 116 check for, 96, 101, 108 determination of puranic, 40, 93-96  
 Regnal years, of Aśoka, 96 of Gautamīputra and Puṣumāvī, 117 provincial governorship and, 41 of Nandivardhana and Mahānandi, 117 of Puṣumāvī, 117 of Yaśjñasrī, 41, 133(1)  
 Reign, Andhra, 5, 20, 146, 149 Gupta, 149 Maurya and Śiśunāka, 93, 94, 118 total dynastic, as a chronological guide, 93-96, 117  
 Revision of Andhra Chronology, 1, 195-202  
 Ripuñjaya, 12  
 Royal Provincial rulers, 25, 43  
 Ṛṣabhadatta, see Uṣabhadāta  
 Ṛṣi, 31, 97, 98, 126  
 Rudradāman, 4 and Puṣumāvī, 19(6b), 50  
 Rudra Śātakarni, 5

## S

- Sagara, 157  
 Śakas, 156-159 Gautamīputra and, see Gautamīputra Indianization of, 158, 159 and Kuṣānas, 200 names of, 158 Sagara and, 157  
 Śaka era, 42 Andhra origin of, 46-50, 166, 167 Kadphises, founder of, 47 Kuṣāna origin of, 45, 47, 49 starting of, 166 use by satraps, 42, 45, 167  
 Śakāditya and Vikramāditya, 160  
 Śakarāt and Khakharāta, 162  
 Śaktiśrī, Śaktuśrī, Satīśrī or Sūktāśrī, 37, see Hakuśrī  
 Śālivāhana or Śātavāhana, 48, 183, 184 Kumāra, 181 tradition, 48, 137-144, 160, 161  
 Saptarṣi Yuga, see Yuga  
 Śātakarni, a clan name, 30, 31, 196 identification with the 3rd king, 2, 19(4), 63, 80, 86 Khāravela and, 2 origin of name, 31 Simuka and, 19(4)  
 Satraps, Western, feudatories to Andhras, 165-168, 198, 199 feudatories to Kuṣānas, 45, 46 of Indian descent, 23 Śaka era and, 137-141  
 Śavdakalpadrumah, 161  
 Scott, H R, 191  
 Simuka, Śiśuka, accession of, 80, 144 correct name, 189 date of, 2, 19(4), 19(5), 137-141 first Andhra king, 3, 12, 13, 14, 19(4), 196 and mānabaka, 140 personal name, 34 Śātakarni and, 2, 19(4), 81, 155 Vikramāditya and, 137-141, 197  
 Śivalakura, 5, 31  
 Śivaskanda Varman, 5  
 Śivaśrī, 5, 34  
 Smith, Vincent A, 5, 6, 14, 16, 19(3), 19(8), 47, 78, 117, 136, 146, 187, 189.  
 Sound resemblance of ślokaś, 98  
 Śrī, prefix, 25, 41, 42, 44  
 Śrīmallakarnī, 133  
 Śrīpārvatīya Andhras, 135  
 Śuddhodana, 125  
 Sudeśna, 7  
 Suhma, 8, 10  
 Suñgas, puranic account of, 12  
 Sūryasiddhānta, 123  
 Suśarman, 13, 14, 196  
 Sūtas, 97

## T

- Tables, (numbers refer to preceding paragraphs), Andhra chronology,  
 Table III, 77 averages of reigning periods of puranic dynasties,  
 Table IX, 115 chronology of Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarni's times,  
 Table XI, 177 four point contact in puranic data, Table X, 145  
 generation intervals, Table VII, 111 generation intervals for British  
 mothers, Table VIII, 113 hypothetical example of English purāna,  
 Table I and Table II, 71 identifications, Table XII, 194 puranic  
 regnal years and chronology, Table IV, puranic reigning periods of  
 dynasties, Table V, puranic stated intervals, Table VI, 100  
 Territories, shuffling of, 50, 144, 147, 148, 163, 197  
 Time intervals, puranic, 107, 120  
 Time records, supposed defects in puranic, 39  
 Titikṣu, 8  
 Traikūṭaka dynasty, 19(8) end of Andhras and, 80, 147, 148  
 Treasure trove act in ancient India, 29, 191

## U

- Ujjayini, 137, 138, 196  
 Uṣabhadāta, Gautamīputra and, 19(6), 174-176 overlord of, 176

## V

- Vāsiṣṭhīputra, 4, 33, 193 Pulumāvi, see Pulumāvi  
 Vāsudeva, 13, 196  
 Vedaśrī, 137, 186-188  
 Vedasiri, 181, 186, 187  
 Victory, camp of, 173  
 Vikramāditya, 137-142, 144, 197 Śakāditya and, 160 Śāhāhāna and,  
 139-141, 144, 160, 161  
 Vikrama, era, 142  
 Viṣṇūnātha Kavi, 183  
 Viṣṇvāyakura, 5, 31, 182, 191 Gautamīputra, 5, 27 meaning of, 183  
 Vāsiṣṭhīputra, 5, 27, 56  
 Viśakhayūpa, 125  
 Viśvāmītra, 9  
 Vyāghrasena, 148

## W

- Wilford, 90  
 Wilson, H. H., 90, 91, 134, 135  
 Woman, importance of, in matriarchal society, 33

## Y

- Yajñaśrī, date of, 134 Gautamīputra, 188 personal name, 34 regnal  
 period of, 41, 133(1) the 27th king, 4 and Yue gnaī, 135  
 Yudhiṣṭhira, 121, 130  
 Yue ai and Candraśrī, 136  
 Yuga, Dharma, and its division, 105, 123 divya, 127 of five years, 105  
 Kali, 105, 106, 123 Kali, extension of, 126, 129 Kali old, 128  
 Kali, social order in, 123, 129 Kalpa, 105, 123 Kṛta, 123, 124  
 Kṛta, second, 129 Pitr, 128 twenty eighth, 128 Saptarṣi, 103-105  
 transition periods of, 105, 106, 127